BAP
D6333e

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No. .....

SCC
7993

444

THE

Examining QUAKER, EXAMINED.

OR, A

Farther Vindication

OF

WATER-BAPTISM:

BY THE

Doctrine and *Practice*

OF THE

INSPIRED APOSTLES.

And from the TESTIMONIES of

Several of the Most *Eminent Authors*, of the People call'd QUAKERS.

Being an ANSWER to

JOSEPH BESSE's *Examination*, of a Discourse on Water-Baptism.

WHEREIN

That Author's Arguments, are fairly Answer'd; and his Contradictions, both to Himself, and his *Friends* are made Manifest.——

1 Thess. v. 21. *Prove all things: hold fast that which is good.*

Jud. i. 3. —— *Earnestly contend for the faith which was once deliver'd unto the saints.*

By DANIEL DOBEL.

CANTERBURY, Printed for the Author, and Sold by him in *Cranbrook*, and *J. Abree* at the Printing-Office.

MDCCXLV. [Price Nine-Pence]

PROPERTY OF PRINCETON REC. APR 1881 THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE

PREFACE.

CHRISTIAN READER,

IF *the Author, to which this is an Answer, had only look'd down on me with Contempt,— I might have* held my Peace: *but, as he hath treated me, in a* Reviling *and* Calumnous *manner; and not only so, but what is worst of all, hath endeavoured, to render the Ordinance of* Water-Baptism contemptible, *or as a mean unworthy Thing; no more to be regarded now, than a* Jewish Ceremony; *I say, from these Considerations, I thought myself concerned, once more, to appear in Print; and in particular, to vindicate the* Authority *for the Practice of* Water-Baptism; *as contained in the* New-Testament. *And that against the open Attempts, of* Joseph Besse *to invalidate it.*

I allow, with the above-mentioned Author, That " Truth delights in Peace, and to spread herself " in a loving and familiar, rather than a polemick " or controversial Manner; but when mistaken " Men do publickly oppose her, a just Defence is " necessary, to shew them their Error, and pre- " vent the spreading it." *See the Preface to a*

Defence of Quakeriſm, *by* Joſeph Beſſe. *I ſay, I allow the above,—— and truſt, that as I eſteem* Water-Baptiſm, *to be a* Goſpel Ordinance; *I hope, that I have endeavoured to* ſpread *it in no other Way. And as I conclude,* Joſeph Beſſe, *to be a miſtaken Man,—— who has publickly oppoſed,* —— *I think* a Juſt Defence is neceſſary, to ſhew him, and his Friends their Error; *and alſo,* to prevent *(what in me lieth)* the ſpreading of it.

And it's very ſtrange to me, that my Opponent, who profeſſes the Chriſtian Name, *ſhould apparently, go on, and forget, that* Charity, *which is a Precept ſo eſſential to that* Holy Religion. *And, that he has ſo done, I truſt will appear, to every impartial Reader, that ſhall attend him with me, through his Treatiſe.*

The Reader may alſo take Notice, that the Authors which I have cited, in the following Pages, are all, except one, ſuch as were, and are acknowledged Quakers. *And this one, who I underſtand was not ſo call'd, is* William Dell: *Yet, he was one, that was the ſame with the* Quakers, *in his Judgment and Writings, with reſpect to the Point of Baptiſm, as will hereafter appear.*

Now, my Reaſon for making uſe of ſuch Authors, *is, the Knowledge and Experience I have, that the* Quakers *pretend, that the* Scriptures, *are a* ſealed Book,—*to ſuch as have not a Meaſure of the ſame Spirit, by which they were given forth.*—

And

And forasmuch, as they also conclude, that their Friends, *especially the most* eminent *of them, were, and are,* led *by what* they esteem *to be the* Good Spirit. —— *I say, from these Considerations, I thought, that the making Use of* their own Authors, *might be a Means, to gain their serious Attention;* —— *in order,* that they might come to see the mistaken Path, which they have been led into; *and so might at last,* by Divine Assistance, *come to know and receive, the* Truth *as it is in Jesus: even, that* Water-Baptism, *was comprised in the* Doctrine; *as well as* practised, *by the* inspired Apostles of Christ.——

It may indeed, seem strange, that I should make Choice of the Authors amongst the Quakers; *in order, to manifest the* Quakers great Mistakes; —— Yet so it is; *and it may be observed, that God by his over-ruling Providence, does often, so order Things, that the very* Opposers, of his Cause, and Truth, *are found to do that, which, instead of being against it, is, what does tend to discover and confirm it. And this, I trust will appear, to be the very Case, from the Passages of the said* Authors *cited, in the following Sheets.*

And here, I also think proper, to acquaint my Readers, that when Joseph Besse's *Examination,* &c. *of my Discourse on* Water-Baptism, *first came to my Hand, I was not at Liberty to give so full an Answer to it, as I thought his* Piece *required: And therefore I only published* An Occasional Letter,

ter, &c. *in order to detect the unkind Spirit,—— that appeared, and some of the Self-Contradictions, —— that were contained* therein, —— *together with the* Falſhoods *declared, and ſuggeſted by that* Author; *on which he grounded his* invidious Inſinuations, and Slanders: *And this I did, that I might ſomewhat* check, *a kind of* Triumph, *which appeared.——*

I would, farther inform my Readers, that in the above-mentioned Letter, *there are ſeveral Things taken Notice of, that are omitted in this: And in particular, the* Quaker's Certificate; *ſign'd by four of their* OWN Friends. *There is alſo, a counter* Certificate *of mine, ſign'd by Perſons of* ſeveral Denominations. *Which Certificate, relates to the Occaſion of this Controverſy: And is therefore very proper, to be read by all, that would know ſomething of the Ground of it.*

I know, many are apt to decry Controverſy; *as* Thomas Lancaſter, *an eminent* Quaker, *well obſerves,* " as if it was not poſſible to glean any " good Thing out of it." *But he goes on, and anſwers, in the Words of a* worthy Author, *who ſays,*

" It is not the Difference, but the Manner of " Handling and Debating that is the Scandal; I " ſee no Way left but that either all muſt agree " in Judgment, or all muſt equally conſent to " be ſilent; or one Side only muſt ſpeak; or

" there

" there must be Debates and Controversies. But " in my Opinion, if we behave ourselves as be- " comes Christians in the Management of them, " this is our only Care in such Cases, nay, I have " often thought that this would make even Con- " troversy itself a Glory to Christianity." *See Preface to* Tho. Lancaster's True Spiritual Baptism, *&c.*

Now, herein I very well agree with Tho. Lancaster, *and his* Author; *and conclude, that,* it is not the Difference, but the Manner of handling and Debating that is the Scandal.——*And, it appears to me, that if* Joseph Besse, *had, paid a proper Regard to this,* his Censures would have been less rigid; and his Arguments *(as he says)* more convincing. *And, I think I have just Cause to say of him, as he does in his Preface to the* Vicar *of* Great Paxton, *only changing the reflecting Terms,* ——*that he* " *was under no Necessity of* stigma- " tizing me *with the odious Names of*" Ambitious, —Insolent Boaster, —Arrogant *and* Presumptuous,— " *since all the useful Truth his Book* " *contains, might have been communicated to the* " *World without them.*" *However, notwithstanding all this, I heartily wish him, and all his* Friends, *well; both in this Life and that which is to come; and should be glad to hear, that the* Veil, *which seems to be upon their Minds, may be removed: that so, they may come clearly to see the* Truth, *as contained and exhibited, in the* Doctrine—*of the* commissioned, *and* inspired *Apostles of Christ.*

And

And now, friendly Reader, *I desire thee to peruse the following Sheets cooly; consider them impartially; and judge with Deliberation, and Candour; which is all I request of thee.*

Daniel Dobel.

THE

PROPERTY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE

Examining QUAKER, *Examined*, &c.

AS Water-Baptiſm, is an *External Ordinance*;—and a Debate begun, between *Joſeph Beſſe* and I, it may be very proper to obſerve, wherein it will appear (at leaſt to me) that *Joſeph Beſſe* and his *Friends*, and I agree, with reſpect to what is a ſufficient *Warrant* or *Authority*, for the *Obſervance* of an *External Ordinance*, under the Goſpel Diſpenſation; that ſo, we may not argue with each other in the Dark, in this important Affair.

And in order hereto, I ſhall take Notice of HIS Words in his *Examination*, &c. Page 8. where he, ſpeaking with regard to his *Friend*,—who preached at the Funeral of the late *John Blundel*, ſays, " He was at " that Time aſſembled with his Friends for the Per- " formance of Religious Worſhip; which *Act of ſo* " *aſſembling*, he—acknowledges to be an *External Ordi-* " *nance to be obſerved under the Goſpel Diſpenſation.*" And then adds,—" That the *Quakers* known Practice is " ſuch."——Now, by the *Act of ſo Aſſembling*, I think, it's evident he means, *aſſembling together for Congregational Worſhip*; and this is what I ſuppoſe, he, as well as his *Friends*, own to be an *External Ordinance* to be obſerved by Chriſtians;——and agreeable hereto, he ſays, as above, " the *Quakers* known Practice is ſuch;"—— and therefore, it's but reaſonable to conclude, that they think, they have ſufficient Warrant for the Obſervance of that *External Ordinance*. And this is what I ſhall not diſpute; for I believe it's a Chriſtian's Duty ſo to do:

But then, I obſerve, that they have no Precept, or Command from Chriſt's own Words, for ſuch a Practice; for tho' our Lord ſays, *Mat.* xviii. 20. *For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midſt of them*; yet, this is no Command for the Continuance of the *Act of ſo aſſembling* as abovementioned, Not, but that I own *Aſſembly Worſhip*—was the Cuſtom of the *Jews*, and that it was alſo the Practice, of the *Primitive* Church of Chriſt; who I conclude, received this *External Ordinance* from the Doctrine or Practice of the immediate Apoſtles of our Lord. For I can't ſuppoſe, that the firſt Churches, (nor yet the *Quakers*) practiſed it, by Vertue of its being a *Jewiſh Cuſtom:* But I rather conclude, that the *Act of ſo aſſembling*, was eſteemed by Chriſtians then, and alſo now, to be an *External Ordinance*, and to be obſerved as ſuch, under this Diſpenſation, by the Authority aforeſaid, *viz.* the Doctrine or Practice of the *inſpired* Apoſtles, according to *Acts* xx. 7. *Heb.* x. 25. in which laſt, we have the Advice of the Apoſtle, to the Believers, that they would, *not forſake the aſſembling of themſelves together, as was the manner of ſome.*—And this well agrees with *Joſeph Beſſe*'s Words, in his Anſwer to the *Vicar* of *Great Paxton*,—in reference to the abovementioned Text, *Heb.* x. 25. See Defence of *Quakeriſm*, p. 252, 253, where ſays he, "As then *the aſſembling ourſelves together* is a "general Command, a general Obedience muſt be "yielded thereto:" And ſays *R. Barclay*, Apology p. 259. "—the Author to the *Hebrews* doth preciſely "prohibit the Neglect of this Duty,—*Heb.* x. 25, 26." Add to this the Words of Mr. *W. Penn*, v. 2. p. 479. ſpeaking with reſpect to the *Quakers* obſerving the *Firſt Day* for aſſembling together, ſays, "'Tis well known, "that in what Country ſoever they live, they follow "the *Practice of the Apoſtles* in aſſembling together on "the *Firſt Day* of the Week: They do it *(ſays he)* "conſtantly and *reverently*."

Now,

Now, I think it's evident from hence, that the *Quakers*, as well as I, conclude, that the Doctrine or Practice of the inspired Apostles, is a sufficient Authority, for the *Act of assembling together* for Religious Worship; and for the Observation of the *First Day of the Week* for so doing.

Now, this *Act of assembling together* for Religious Worship, *Joseph Besse* owns, that the *Quakers* acknowledge to be an *External Ordinance, to be observed under this Dispensation.*

So that, here we do very well agree. And this is what I thought proper in the first Place to observe; because, it's a *Concession* of his; by which, it will appear, that, as *Water-Baptism*, is an *External Ordinance*, as well as the *Act of so assembling*; It's evident *on his own Principles*, that Water-Baptism is also to be *observed* under this Dispensation; forasmuch, as this was—taught and practised by the *inspired* Apostles. For, if their Doctrine and Practice, be a sufficient Authority, for the Continuance and Practice, of one *External Ordinance*, I think it must and will be acknowledged to be so, in another, by every impartial considerate Reader.

Now, what *Joseph Besse* says, with regard to Assembly-Worship, " *as then the assembling ourselves together is a* " *general Command, a general Obedience* MUST *be yielded* " *thereto.*"

So say I, that, as *Water-Baptism* is a general Command, a general Obedience ought in like Manner to be yielded to it. For as it's acknowledged, that *Heb.* x. 25. contains a general Exhortation to continue the *assembling* of Christians together,—so it's likewise evident, that *Acts* ii. 38. contains a general Doctrine for *Water-Baptism*; for, saith the inspired Apostle, *Repent, and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ.*—

And the Baptism here mentioned, is owned by that eminent *Quaker*, *J. Pike*, in his Treatise of Baptism—p. 107. to be *Water-Baptism.* So that, if these Things were duly considered, by the *Quakers*, I am ready to

conclude, that *Light* would break forth, with respect to *Water-Baptisms*, being an *External Ordinance*, of the *Gospel Church*. However, it's evident, it has as great Authority, if not a greater, than, for the *Act of so assembling*,—on the *First Day*;—which *W. P.* says *they constantly observe with Reverence*.

I shall next take Notice, of *Joseph Besse*'s Inconsistency, with respect to the Use of *Unscriptural Terms*; which he so much exclaims against in others, when at the same Time, he is so remarkably full of such *Terms* himself.

See his Piece called an *Examination*, &c. p. 15. where he is taking Notice of my making use of the Terms, *Moral*, and *Positive*, with regard to Duties, says, "These "Terms *of Distinction he found not in the New-Testament*; "*they are either of his own* Coining, *or borrowed of other* "*Men. Had the Distinction itself been a Doctrine of Christ-* "*ianity, he might have expressed it in plain Scripture Words,* "*which are ever sufficient for that Purpose*; *but 'tis a Sign* "*that forward Men are* obtruding *upon others their own* "*Erroneous* Notions."——

Thus, here we may see, that even while *Joseph* is exclaiming against them, and signifying that the Use thereof *is a bad Sign*; yet, as it were in the same Breath, he makes use of such *Terms* himself! And but a little before, in the same Page, he has these *Terms* —*Universal* Charity, of which he also says,—"the Gospel of Christ *exhibits*."——So, that just before and while he inveighs against *unscriptural Terms*, he is fruitful in the Use of them.

Again, *Exam.* p. 21. where he insinuates, that I made use of the Term *Ordinary*, as well as the Term *Extraordinary*, with respect to the different *Gifts* of the Spirit of God; he goes on saying, "Nor are the "Terms *Ordinary* and *Extraordinary* to be found in "Holy Writ, for which *Reason* they may be justly laid "aside, as *meer Inventions* of mistaken Men, to express "their narrow Conceptions of the pouring forth of the "Spirit of God, which is OMNIPOTENT, UNI-"VERSAL, and UNLIMITED."

But,

But, what an unaccountable Author is this! that can't refrain from being full of *Unſcriptural Terms*, no, not while he is correcting others, for the Uſe of them! And indeed when I read his Works, it appears, that he hath been long accuſtomed to the Practice of it; as is plain from his Anſwer to *Patrick Smith*, printed in the Year 1732. See *Defence of Quakeriſm*; which doth alſo abound with ſuch *Terms*; and in particular with thoſe very *Terms* he hath been *carping* at above. See Sect. 4. p. 62. where ſays he—"We do aſſert that the *Ordi-*" *nary* Inſpirations, Illuminations, and Aſſiſtances of " the Spirit, are of the ſame Kind with the EX-" TRAORDINARY."——And p. 20. of the ſame Book, he finds Fault with the *Vicar* for uſing the ſame Terms; when indeed, I believe I might cite near half the Pages, in his Anſwer to the *Vicar*, where he or his *Friends*, whoſe Words he has cited, hath uſed *Unſcriptural Terms*: ſo likewiſe the ſame in his *Examination*, &c. Neither can I find one Author among the *Quakers* that has wrote of *Baptiſm*—and the *Supper*,— but what have crowded in *Unſcriptural Terms*; nay, many of them, abound therewith. So that what can be concluded leſs, if *Joſeph Beſſe* will allow his own Way of arguing, but, that he, and the reſt of the Writers amongſt the *Quakers*, have combined together, *to obtrude their own erroneous Notions* on Mankind.

And, his frequent Practice, of uſing *Unſcriptural Terms*, and inveighing againſt it in others,—makes me conclude, that our Lord's Advice is very proper to be given him, *Mat.* vii. 3, 4, 5.—*Firſt caſt out the beam out of thine own eye; and then ſhalt thou ſee clearly to caſt out the mote out of thy brother's eye.* And, if we may judge of his End, in uſing ſuch *Terms*, by what he *ſuggeſts* is the *Deſign* of others, in ſo doing, it will then follow, that, his End in adapting ſuch *Phraſes* in his Work, is *to keep his Readers ignorant of his Meaning!* See *Exam.* &c. p. 44.——

I could obſerve much more of this Nature; tho', here we have *Joſeph Beſſe*, abundantly, inconſiſtent, and contrary to himſelf! But yet, once more p. 11. of my Diſcourſe on *Water-Baptiſm*, where, I was ſpeaking with regard to the Accompliſhment, of the *Propheſy* of *Joel*, as mentioned *Acts* ii. 16, 17. I ſay, " And this " is the Thing promiſed by our Lord in the Text, even " the EXTRAORDINARY Gift of the Spirit of " God."——In Anſwer to which, *Joſeph Beſſe*, in his *Exam. &c.* p. 21.—ſays, " Nor are the Terms *Ordi-* " *nary* and *Extraordinary* to be found in *Holy Writ*, for " which Reaſon they may be juſtly laid aſide, as *meer* " *Inventions* of miſtaken Men." ——

—But firſt, how comes *Joſeph Beſſe* to croud in the Term *Ordinary*, and thereby inſinuate, as tho' it was mine? when I have not there uſed it; Is this a *Mark* of a fair Writer? is this doing as he would be done by? Hath he forgot that he uſed that *Term* himſelf, with regard to the Gifts of the Spirit, as p. 62, to the *Vicar?* where, ſays he,—*We do aſſert, that the* ORDINARY *Inſpirations*, &c.——But, here by the Way, I muſt obſerve to *Joſeph*,—that *he* is under a Miſtake, in ſaying the Term *Ordinary*, is not to be found in *Holy Writ*; and if he pleaſes to look *Ezek.* xvi. 27. he may ſee that the Term *Ordinary*, is there to be found; and himſelf to be a miſtaken Man.

And, ſecondly, as to the *Term*, *Extraordinary*, I muſt take the Freedom to tell him, that tho' I find it not in *Holy Writ*, yet, I find it uſed by himſelf, in his Anſwer to the *Vicar*, p. 41. and that with regard to the very ſame *Text*, Acts ii 16, 17. about which, he ſo much cenſures me for uſing of it. His Words are, " *which* " *pouring forth of the Spirit*, *was*, *in an* EXTRAORDI- " NARY *Manner*, *upon the Apoſtles and others at the Day* " *of Pentecoſt.*"——

Now, what leſs than this, can be obſerved, from his own Way of Arguing, ſince he uſes thoſe *Terms* himſelf,—than, that he is a *Follower*, of the *meer Inventions* of

of *miſtaken Men?* Therefore, *thou art inexcuſible, O* Joſeph,—*in this thy Judgment on me; for thou hath often done the ſame thy ſelf.* And therefore, whether he deſerves *Commendation*, or *Blame* for his Labour, I ſhall leave his *Friends* to judge.

And, as to his *reviling*, *taunting*, and *unkind* Language, which he hath ſo freely beſtowed on me, in his *Exam.* I ſhall here, give a Place to ſome of it; that ſo his Friends may ſee, with what an *unchriſtian Spirit* he compoſed his *Piece*, when he had not the leaſt Provocation, from me ſo to do. It's true, I publiſhed a Diſcourſe on *Water Baptiſm*; but then, I no where therein made uſe of reviling Words; nay, I was ſo far from it, that it was quite the contrary; for therein I ſignified, that the *Quakers* were ſuch, whom *I was far from cenſuring*,—as p. 18. of that Diſcourſe. And farther, with reſpect to this, ſeveral of them, have ſignified to me, that I had therein, treated them in a *kind* and *friendly* Manner.——And, I could with Truth, ſay much more of this Nature; but as to this, I rather chuſe Silence.

And, as to what is contained in the Preface to my Diſcourſe on *Water-Baptiſm*; I am conſcious to myſelf, that I have not ſaid any thing, but what is *Truth*. And in particular, when p. 7. I declare, *my real Concern for the religious Welfare* of the People call'd *Quakers*; which Declaration of mine, he would fain inſinuate, was only *Hypocriſy*; for, ſays he, *Exam.* p. 13. with reſpect to my Concern, for the religious Welfare of the *Quakers*, he, " THINKS TO BE BUT WORDS." and p. 41. he repreſents me, as a *deceitful* Perſon."——

Now, as theſe Reflections, relate to my own perſonal Character, I chuſe to anſwer, in the Words of his own *Friend*, *John Pay*, of *Tenterden* in *Kent*, who is one of the *Chief* among the *Quakers* in our Parts, with whom I have always found a *kind* and *friendly* Reception, which has been carried on between us for many Years, with a *reciprocal* Intimacy and Friendſhip, who, in a Letter to me, dated the 29th of the *ſixth* Month, 1744, (which was

ſince

ſince this Debate began) among other Things, he ſays as follows:

" *Eſteemed Friend* Daniel Dobel, *Having very ſeriouſly* " *conſidered the Controverſy, that happened of late between* " *thyſelf, and ſome of my Friends,*——*and the Carriage* " *that hath* always *appeared in* thee *to* US, *doth* demon- " ſtrate, *that it proceeded from a* Heart *and* Mind *that is* " truly honeſt *and* ſincere; *and this Carriage to us, will* " *be and hath been* always *acknowledged by us, with due* " *Reſpect at all Times.*"——He concludes ſaying, " *I hope* " *theſe Lines may have ſome Influence over thy Mind, to* " *lay down thy* Pen, *and ſo to unite in that* Love *and* Re- " ſpect, *that hath* always *been ſettled between us, is the* " *true Wiſh and ſincere Deſire, of thy loving Friend and well* " *Wiſher to thee and all thine,* John Pay."

Now, whoſe Words are moſt to be *credited*, whether *Joſeph Beſſe*'s, to whom I am a Stranger,— or his *Friend*, who hath had a particular Acquaintance with me for many Years, I leave my Readers to judge.

Beſides, how contrary are the above Inſinuations of my *Opponent*, to the *true Spirit* of that *Chriſtian Charity*, which the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, 1 *Cor.* xiii. 5. that he ſays, *is not eaſily provoked, nor thinketh no Evil*; and not only ſo, but it's even contrary to *Joſeph*'s own Declaration; ſee Defence of *Quakeriſm*, p. 71. where ſays he, " *'tis* " *our Buſineſs to defend the Truth without Breach of Charity.*" —But, I think he was very much wide from his Buſineſs, when he penn'd the above, and following *unkind Inſinuations*, and *harſh reviling Reflections*; as Preface, p. 3. of his *Exam. &c.* where, tho' I believe, he hath very little, if any perſonal Knowledge of me, yet there he repreſents me as a Perſon, " *full of my ſelf.*" And p. 6. that what I had done in publiſhing my Diſcourſe *proceeded from* AMBITION.——P. 11. that I am a *Talkative*; when I queſtion, whether he ever ſaw me; however, I am certain, we never had Converſation together. So, that it's plain, he does not pay much Regard to *Pſal.* xv. 3. by his Readineſs to *take up a*

Re-

Reproach.——P. 13. he would fain make me out an *Inſolent Boaſter*; only becauſe I ſaid *I challenged all the Quakers*; and this I had not done, had not his *Friend* W. P. challenged before, the ſame Day, all the World.—— And when I came to him in the Evening, and accepted of his Challenge, he declined the Argument. See the *Preface* to my Diſcourſe of *Water-Baptiſm*, and my *Occaſional Letter*, p. 10. and who, if any was, guilty of *Inſolent Boaſting*, I leave the World to judge, whether it was I, who *challenged all the Quakers*; or his *Friend*, who *challenged all the learned Rabbies on Earth*, and the *unlearned World*; when he himſelf, is an unlearned Man. Again, p. 16, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34, 38, 40, and 44. in theſe ſeveral Pages, *Joſeph Beſſe*, would *ſtigmatize* me with being a *Sermon-Writer*; which, I ſuppoſe, he thinks to be a *Crime*. However, be that as it will, he does not know that I have wrote more than one. Beſides, I have declared, and he muſt know it, that to write *Sermons* is not my Cuſtom. Now, whether he can clear himſelf from being guilty of *reviling*, I leave to be conſidered. If I had not ſet my Name to my Diſcourſe, he might have had ſome Pretence for calling—Names; but as I have, it ſhews, that ſuch Procedure came not from the *beſt of Spirits*. And, from the ſame *unkind Spirit* he infers, that I am *arrogant* and *preſumptuous*; Nay, that I have *aſſumed to myſelf a Power to ſet aſide the Goſpel Duty of Converſion of the Heart.*—Exam. p 30. And all this, only becauſe I conclude, that the Word *Baptized*, mentioned *Acts* ii. 38. doth intend *Water-Baptiſm*; and that 'tis not the ſame with the Word *Converſion*, contained Chap. iii. 19. I ſay, for this, I am repreſented as above! But whether he has kept cloſe to his *Buſineſs* here,—without *Breach of Charity*, I leave to the Judgment of all. I could mention more *Fruits* of the ſame *unkind Spirit*, but chuſe to forbear. And indeed, I was not a little ſurprized to find it as above; knowing, I had not given any juſt Occaſion.——And, I was for ſome Time at a Loſs, what Uſe or End ſuch re-

reviling and *harſh* Language could anſwer; till at laſt, reading *Joſeph Beſſe's Defence of Quakeriſm*, p. 1. where he takes Notice of the *unkind Reflections* of the *Vicar*, ſays, " *Harſh Terms, by raiſing terrible Ideas in the Imagi-* " *nation, may probably prepoſſeſs weak Readers in Favour of* " *one Side*; I ſay, till I read this, I was at a Loſs, what Uſe ſuch Treatment might anſwer; but now, I find, that according to him, it ſerves—*to prepoſſeſs weak Readers in Favour of one Side.* And here I ſhall conclude this in the Words of *Joſeph Beſſe* to the *Vicar*, p. 316. only changing the reflecting Terms, that, *he might have forborn his* Reflections, of—*Ambition*,—*Inſolent Boaſting*,—*Arrogant*, and *Preſumptuous*,—&c. " *had he not thought* " *thoſe Bugbears neceſſary to fright Men from diſcerning his* " *Lack of Argument!*" And *Exam.* p. 6. *Joſeph Beſſe* is ſpeaking with regard to my publiſhing my Diſcourſe on Water-Baptiſm, ſays, " *the Occaſion he aſſigns for publiſh-* " *ing his Diſcourſe is alſo feigned, ſome Part of his Ma-* " *nuſcript having been ſeen long before that Occaſion* " *happened*,"—viz. (the Burial of *John Blundel* late of *Cranbrook*)—Now, as to this, of my *Manuſcript* having been ſeen long before,—I declare, is *notoriouſly falſe*; for none of it was wrote till afterwards. So that, the unkind Uſe he makes of it, is built on an *Untruth*.—See more as to this, in my *Occaſional Letter*, p. 7, 8.

I will now go on to conſider *Joſeph Beſſe*'s Anſwers to what I have offered, from ſeveral Texts in the *New Teſtament*, in order to ſhew that Water-Baptiſm is an *Ordinance* of the Goſpel Church; and ſhall begin, according as *Joſeph Beſſe* has inſerted from my Preface, p. 5, 6. where I told *his Friend*, in Converſation, " That " it was very evident, that the Apoſtle, who was then " under the immediate Influence of the Spirit of God, " did in that Paſſage recommend to the Heart-pricked " *Jews*, two Duties, viz. *Repentance* and *Baptiſm*, and " annexed two Promiſes as Encouragements to en- " gage them to the Practice thereof; which were, the " Remiſſion of Sin, and the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt;

" and

" and that the Baptiſm there recommended by the " Spirit of God, was diſtinguiſh'd from the Baptiſm or " Gift of the Holy Ghoſt; and that therefore it was " the Baptiſm of Water, there intended, *Acts* ii. 38."
To which *Joſeph Beſſe* by way of Anſwer, ſays, " The " Words of that Text are, " *Then Peter ſaid unto them,* " *repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of* " *Jeſus Chriſt, for the remiſſion of ſins, and ye ſhall receive* " *the gift of the Holy Ghoſt.* This Text *(ſays he)* makes " no Mention at all of Water, nor does the Context " neceſſarily infer it. The Word, *Repent*, denotes a " Sorrow of Heart; and the Words, *be baptized*, MAY " denote the purifying or cleanſing of the Heart, where- " by it is effectually converted or turned to the Lord: " Now thoſe who are thus purified or cleanſed, and " their Hearts effectually converted or turned to the " Lord, are fitly prepared and qualified to receive the " Gift of the *Holy Ghoſt*. And to put this Matter out " of all Doubt, the ſame Apoſtle *Peter* in the next " Chapter, ver. 19. thus explains his own Meaning, " ſaying there, *Repent ye therefore and be converted, that* " *your ſins may be blotted out, when the times of refreſhing* " *ſhall come from the preſence of the Lord.* And what are " the *Times* of *Refreſhing* but the *Times of Receiving* the " Gift of the Holy Spirit? In a Word, theſe two " Texts vary in Terms, but have one and the ſame " Meaning. Let therefore the Apoſtles own Conſtruc- " tion of the Words, be baptized, take Place, and in- " ſtead thereof read, *be converted*, as in the parallel " *Text* is expreſſed, and (ſays he) the Relator's Tri- " umph upon this Text will be found of no Force."

Anſwer. Here, I can't but obſerve, what a Harmony and Likeneſs, appears between *Joſeph Beſſe*, and his *Friend R. Claridge*, in the foregoing Paragraph. See the Life and Poſthumous Works of *R. Claridge*, p. 358. where, you will find, the ſame for Subſtance,—only, I think *Joſeph Beſſe* ſeems ſomewhat to *flag*, at his very *Cuſet*; tho' in the firſt Sentence to the Words of the

Text, he indeed ſpeaks out with ſome Courage; having *Truth* of his Side; but in the ſecond, there is a manifeſt Abatement; for ſays he in the firſt, " The Word " *Repent*, denotes a Sorrow of Heart;" but when he comes to ſpeak to the Words *be baptized*, he appears ſomewhat faint; for then it is "—the Words, *be bap-* " *tized*, MAY DENOTE the purifying, or cleanſing " of the Heart."——

Now, ſuppoſe I ſhould ſay, in Oppoſition to this, that,—*be baptized*, MAY NOT DENOTE,—what wonderful ſtrong Arguing here would be.—*But what would ſuch Arguing prove?*—Indeed, it appears to me, that if *Joſeph Beſſe*, had not read his *Friend Claridge* on this Text, he would have had, but very little to have ſaid to it; However, either by the Help of his *Friend's Book*, or a good Memory,—he has we ſee, brought forth ſomething, and by a little Addition, and changing a few *Terms*, has in ſome Meaſure ſaved himſelf, from being guilty of *Plagiariſm*, viz. ſtealing other Mens Works. But, after he has ſaid, that, " The Words, *be baptized*, " MAY denote the purifying or cleanſing of the Heart, " whereby it is effectually converted or turned to the " Lord," he goes on, ſaying, " Now thoſe who are " thus purified or cleanſed, and their Hearts effectually " converted and turned to the Lord, are fitly *prepared* " and *qualified* to receive the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt."

Where, by receiving the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt, *Joſeph Beſſe* I think will not deny, but that it intends, being *baptized with the Holy Ghoſt*. So it's alſo plain, that by thoſe Words, *be baptized*, the Apoſtle, according to him, did not intend, the *Baptiſm* of the *Holy Ghoſt*; for ſays he, " thoſe who are THUS purified, " —and *their Hearts effectually converted or turned to the* " *Lord*; are *fitly* PREPARED—*to receive the Gift of the* " *Holy Ghoſt*." viz. are fitly PREPARED, to receive Spiritual Baptiſm.——So that, it appears from *Joſeph*'s own Words, that the Terms, *be baptized*, does not ſignify *Spirit-Baptiſm*, but, rather ſomething, which accord-

cording to him, is *preparatory* to it. Now then, what Baptiſm can be thought to be intended, in the Text, if it be not *Water Baptiſm?* And indeed, this moſt plainly appears, from the Apoſtle's Words, for ſays he, to ſuch who was *pricked in their Heart*, and applied themſelves to the *Apoſtles*, ſaying, *Men and Brethren, what ſhall we do? Then* Peter (as the Mouth of the reſt of the Apoſtles) *ſaid unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, for the remiſſion of ſins, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt.*

Now, from hence I obſerve, that tho' this *Text*, makes no expreſs Mention of *Water*, yet, it neceſſarily implies it; as will hereafter appear. The Word, *Repent*, does not only denote a Sorrow of Heart; but alſo, a ſincere and hearty Amendment of Life; which is the ſame with *Converſion*. And the Words, *be baptized*, does ſignify, a being dipp'd, or a being *baptized* in *Water*; and that in the *Name* of *Jeſus Chriſt*. And, to put this latter out of all Doubt, the ſame Apoſtle, chap. x. ver. 47, 48. does explain, what it is, to be baptized in the Name of the Lord;—for thus we read, *Can any man forbid* WATER, *that theſe ſhould not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghoſt, as well as we? And he* (that is the ſame Apoſtle) *commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.* Now, to be *baptized in the Name of the Lord*, and *in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt*, is according to *J. Pike*, p. 41. one and the ſame; therefore from hence we ſee, that to be baptized in the *Name of Jeſus Chriſt*, or of *the Lord*, is by the Apoſtle, to be *baptized* in *Water*. So, that it's plain, that *Water-Baptiſm* is intended, *Acts* ii. 38.——Beſides, the Apoſtles does there diſtinguiſh, the *Baptiſm* ſpoken of in the *Text*; from this *Baptiſm*, or rather the Gift of the *Holy Ghoſt*, which laſt, is what he annexes, together with *Remiſſion of Sins*, by Way of Promiſe: From all which, it's plain, that *Acts* ii. 38. contains two Duties, viz. *Repentance*,---and *Water-Baptiſm*; and that two Promiſes is annexed, as above. ——And indeed, what elſe, but Water-Baptiſm, can

be

be underſtood, from *Joſeph Beſſe*'s own Words to the *Vicar*, Defence of *Quakeriſm*, p. 296. where, with regard to *Acts* ii. 38. he ſays, " *Peter* ADMONISHED " ſome adult Perſons who BELIEVED, to be *baptized*; " and tells them, that the Promiſe of the *Holy Ghoſt* was " to THEM and to their Children."——And very clear, and agreeable, are the Words of that eminent *Quaker Joſeph Pike*, in his *Treatiſe* of *Baptiſm*, and the *Supper*, p. 107 ſays,--" The Qualifications which ren- " der'd any fit Subjects of *Water-Baptiſm*, either under " *John*, or where the Apoſtles and Diſciples baptized, " *as appears by plain Scripture*, were their being capable " of being *taught*, *believing*, *confeſſing*, and *repenting*, " agreeable to theſe following Texts, *Mat.* iii. 6. *Mark* " i. 4, 5. *Acts* ii. 38, 41. Chap. viii. 12, 37, 38. Chap. " xviii. 8. But (ſays he) Infants were not capable of " either of theſe Qualifications; conſequently were not " the Subject of *Water-Baptiſm*." Well ſaid *Joſeph*,--- here thou haſt got the *Truth* of thy Side, and argues well.---But, how manifeſt is it, that *Joſeph Pike* does here own *Acts* ii. 38. to intend *Water-Baptiſm*; and alſo, by his adding in the 41ſt Verſe, that the *Apoſtle*, had preached or recommended *Water-Baptiſm*; and that many in Obedience to the *Word Received*, were thus baptized: or as the Text reads it ver. 41. *Then they that gladly received* HIS WORD, *were baptized:*——So that it's evident, that both in the 38th, and alſo in the 41ſt Verſe, *he* doth here without any Reſerve, allow, that this Text intends *Water-Baptiſm*.

And ſays *Joſeph Beſſe*, the Apoſtle admoniſhed ſome--- to *be baptized*. Now to admoniſh, is to exhort or adviſe;---which clearly ſhews, that the Thing intended was a DUTY, as I have before in my Argument obſerved. So that, what *Joſeph Beſſe* has offered here, inſtead of its being againſt *Water-Baptiſm* being intended, in *Acts* ii. 38. is in Favour of it: And when we add to it, the Judgment of *Joſeph Pike*, what *Quaker* in the World can ſay ought againſt it? So that inſtead of *Joſeph*

ſeph Beſſe's ſhewing the Weakneſs of my Argument; and that *Water-Baptiſm* is not intended in *Acts* ii. 38. he and his *Friend* both concur (tho' its like it was not deſigned) *to ſupport it!*

And, as to his ſaying that the Words *be baptized*, Acts ii. 38. and the Words *be converted*, Chap. iii. 19. " *have one and the ſame Meaning*, and that it's *a Parallel*," I ſay, as to this, *it's denied*; and he is called upon to prove it.

And as to his Inſinuation, that I *triumph* on *Acts* ii. 38. it does but farther tend, to diſcover, what Kind of *Spirit*, he was *led by*. Let him ſhew, if he can, but one Expreſſion, in my Argument from *Acts* ii. 38. that is of the Nature of *Triumph*. Let him make it appear, by my Words, that I have ſaid any Thing from *this Text*, like it; which is what he ought at leaſt, firſt to have done; before he had been ſo free of his *unkind* and *taunting Reflections*. But alas, they that read his Works with regard to *Baptiſm*, muſt content themſelves with ſuch *Kind* of *Language*, inſtead of *real* or *better* Arguments.

And *Exam.* p. 13. *Joſeph Beſſe* inſinuates, that I have *endeavoured to miſlead* my *Readers*; and alſo adds, that, " toward the Concluſion of my *Preface* have *miſled my-*" *ſelf*, *when I call* William Dell *an eminent Quaker*, who " never *was one called a Quaker.*" Now, as to the firſt, I leave to the Judgment of others; but by the Way, I can't but obſerve, the Uncharitableneſs of this Author.——

And, whether *William Dell* was one *called a Quaker or not*, it's plain, he was one in his Principles concerning *Baptiſm*. Nay, it appears to me, if I may regard what he himſelf ſays, Preface to the *Doctrine of Baptiſms*, where his Words are, " I ſhall ſpeak much otherwiſe " than all former or latter Writers whatever."——And p. 21. he does in Effect own, that he was *the firſt Man that oppoſed Water-Baptiſm*: I ſay, from hence it appears to me, that he was the *very* Founder of *Quakeriſm*; at leaſt

leaſt in this Point. However, it's plain that *Joſeph Beſſe* owns him, in the *Point* of *Baptiſm*; for ſays he of *Dell*, Exam. 13, 14. that " he became enabled to diſ-" cover the *Truth* in this POINT, and to explain the " Doctrine of *Baptiſms* with a convincing Evidence and " Clearneſs: that his Sentiments in this Caſe were the " ſame with thoſe of the *Quakers*."——

And, I could cite ſeveral other of their Authors, to the ſame Purpoſe; and, *Dell's Doctrine of Baptiſms*, has been often commended to me, by ſeveral *Quakers*, as the only *Piece*, to ſet me (as they ſaid) right in the Point of *Baptiſm*; and therefore, I hope it was no great Fault in me, to call him a Quaker; I finding, he had in a great Meaſure got the Principles; tho' it's like he lived before any *Sect* was called by that Name.

And p. 14. he is pleaſed to cite the Text I inſiſted on, which is *Luke* xxiv. 49. *And behold, I ſend the promiſe of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jeruſalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.* Now, on my making Choice of this *Text*, he goes on ſaying,

" 'Tis obſervable, that he makes Choice of a *Text* " which has not any Relation to his Subject, and where-" in nothing is either mentioned or intended concern-" ing *Water-Baptiſm*. His Reaſon for that Choice WE " ſee not, unleſs perhaps his AMBITION was, that " the Proof of his Point might not depend on the *Text*, " but on his own Abilities."——

Now, whether *Joſeph Beſſe*, has kept to his Buſineſs here, *without Breach of Charity*; and whether, the above, be a Mark of a true *Critick*, or *Caviller*, I leave to the Judgment of all *ſober* Men. However, ſince he, nor his Friends, can't ſee a Reaſon for this my Choice; I hope, (if they are not wilfully blind) that I ſhall be able, to diſcover one to them.

And, in order ſo to do, I obſerve, that this *Text*, has a manifeſt Reference to the promiſed *Endowment*, of the Apoſtles, with the *Power from on High*: which was conferred on them at the Day of *Pentecoſt*. And is well

ex-

expreſſed by *Joſeph Beſſe*, to the *Vicar*, p. 41. " Which " pouring forth of the Spirit, (ſays he) was, in an " *extraordinary* Manner, upon the Apoſtles and *others* at " the Day of *Pentecoſt*." And in his *Exam.* p. 25. he goes on farther, and ſays, " by this *Spirit* of *Truth*, " were the Apoſtles *endued* with *Power from on high* to " *qualify* them for the Work whereunto they were " called." And p. 26. " That the End and Deſign of " the Apoſtles being *endued with Power from on high*, " was, that they might be *able Miniſters* of the *New* " *Teſtament*, not of the Letter, but of the Spirit."—— And, this well agrees, with what I have obſerved, p. 13, 14, and 15. of my Diſcourſe of *Water-Baptiſm*.

Now, as the Apoſtles were thus *endowed* with the *Spirit* of God; I conclude, that they in the Diſcharge of their Miniſtry, were accordingly *dictated* by the ſame Spirit of TRUTH: So, that what they *recommended and taught*, might be juſtly deemed, and regarded, as the Mind and Will of God: and as ſuch, to be practiſed under this Diſpenſation. And I finding, that they *taught* and *recommended Water-Baptiſm*, I concluded, that *Luke* xxiv. 47. was a very proper *Text*, to ſhew, that *Water-Baptiſm*, was compriſed in the Doctrine of TRULY *inſpired* Perſons. And therefore, in order to ſhew this to others, I *traced* the Doctrine and Practice, of the endowed Apoſtles; as recorded in the *Acts*: and truſt, I have plainly diſcovered, that *Water-Baptiſm*, was contained in the Doctrine, they preached. And therefore, as I had a View to this, I thought this *Text*, was a proper one, to *lead* Perſons on, that ſo they might clearly ſee, on what a ſolid Foundation *Water-Baptiſm* ſtands; even, that it was contained in, and held forth by the *pure Miniſtry*, and Doctrine of the Goſpel, as delivered by *divinely inſpired Men*.

Now, tho' this *Text*, makes no expreſs Mention of *Water-Baptiſm*; yet, as it has Relation, to that *divine Power*, *the Apoſtles received*, by the Guidance, Authority, and Direction of which, they among other Things,

preached the Doctrine of *Water-Baptism*; I say, the Consideration of this, hath a manifest Tendency, to shew, by what *Authority*, the Apostles preached and propagated, that Doctrine: even, that their *Mission, and Authority was of God.* And therefore, it appears to me, that *Luke* xxiv. 47. is not an improper *Text*, to ground such a Discourse on.

Besides, I have found by *happy Experience*, that when *it pleased God, of his infinite Goodness*, to discover to me the Authority for *Water-Baptism*, in this *Light*; it had a great and powerful Tendency, to remove those Doubts, which formerly were raised in me; by my frequent Conversation with the *Quakers*. *(For which blessed, Discovery of the Truth, I desire to be for ever thankful.)* And not only so, but, I have often since found, when this *Controversy* hath been urged on me; that, the vindicating *Water-Baptism*, on this *Gospel Foundation*, hath, by the Blessing of God; had, in some good Degree, a manifest Effect, to stop the Mouths of *Gainsayers*.

And therefore, whatever *Joseph Besse* and his *Friends* may think; I conclude, that I had sufficient, and good *Reason*; for my making Choice, of this Passage, to ground a Discourse of *Water-Baptism* on. I could add more, but I hope, that what I have said, may be sufficient, to satisfy his, and his *Friends Curiosity*, with respect to my Reason, in this Point.

I shall next go on, to take Notice of that, which more nearly concerns the Point in Debate; namely, to insert the *Texts* by me cited, in the Discourse of *Water-Baptism*, &c. and also the Substance of what I offered therefrom: And then shall, in like Manner, give a Place to what *Joseph Besse* hath said by Way of Answer; together, with some Remarks—I shall make thereon. ——I having in the 12th, 13th, and 14th Pages of my Discourse of *Water-Baptism*, took Notice of the Accomplishment, of the Promise of the *Holy Ghost* on the Apostles,—at the Day of *Pentecost*, Acts ii.—and of *Peter's* preaching by the *divine Influence of the Spirit.*—I pro-

proceeded to take Notice of the 38th Verſe; where *Peter* ſays, *Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, for the remiſſion of ſins, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt.* I then went on to obſerve, " That " tho' this Sermon was, perhaps, as moving, and as " powerful as any, yet, it's evident, that the Apoſtle's " Preaching did not baptize the *Heart-prick'd Jews*; tho' " it had the good Effect to prepare many of them for " it; which when he ſaw, he adviſed them to it. " From hence I obſerve, that preaching the Goſpel, is " not baptizing: tho' ſome do ſo argue and ſay, that it's " ſo meant in the Commiſſion of our Lord. *(a)* But " it's not my Intention now to run far, into this Con- " troverſy, but principally to ſhew that *Water-Baptiſm* " is a Goſpel Ordinance. And I conceive, that a right " Underſtanding of this Paſſage, will—give Light into " this Controverſy; foraſmuch as none can deny, but " that the Apoſtle, was then under the Influence of the " Spirit; which was beſtowed on him, not for his own " Sake only; but chiefly, that others thereby, through " him, might be inſtructed into the Knowledge of the " Will of God; and their Duty in Obedience to him, " under this Diſpenſation.

" And farther, let it be obſerved, That in this En- " quiry of the *Heart-prick'd Jews*, there is not the leaſt " Intimation, that they applied themſelves to the *Apoſtles* " with Minds prepoſſeſſed, as was the Caſe of ſome " *believing Jews*; *(b)* but they addreſſed themſelves to " them, with Hearts wholly given up to attend their " Advice and Inſtructions; ſo that there is no Reaſon " to imagine, that the *Apoſtle*, from any Apprehenſion of " *Weakneſs*, or *Fondneſs*, in them to any Thing, (as " ſome pretend it was) did give Advice, different from " what he would otherwiſe have done; foraſmuch as

(a) Robert Barkclay *on Baptiſm and the Supper*, p. 38. And Law- ſon *on Baptiſm*, p. 31, 32. Mat. xxviii. 20.

(b) Acts xxi. 23, 24.

" there was not the leaſt Colour or Appearance of any " ſuch *Fondneſs in them*; but, that they were ſuch, as " ſincerely made a free Application to the Apoſtles, in " that great and important Enquiry, *What ſhall we do?* " So that we may juſtly conclude, that what the Apoſtle " recommended to them, was from the *pure Dictates of* " *the Spirit of God*; as that which was the Duty of Per- " ſons to practice, and obſerve, that would rightly " embrace Chriſtianity.

" I then went on to conſider the Words of the Apoſtle, " which runs thus; *Then Peter ſaid unto them, Repent,* " *and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jeſus* " *Chriſt, for the remiſſion of ſins, and ye ſhall receive the* " *gift of the Holy Ghoſt.* (a)

" From hence it's evident, that the *inſpired Apoſtle,* " doth point out or recommend to the *Heart-prick'd* " *Jews*, two Duties; and to engage them to practice " accordingly, annexes two encouraging Conſiderations, " or Promiſes; that is the *Remiſſion of Sins*, and *the Gift* " *of the Holy Ghoſt:* which are two of the principal " Bleſſings of the Goſpel.—The firſt *of which* Duties that " the Apoſtle directed to, was *Repentance*; which im- " plies a Conviction of Soul, accompanied with Sorrow " for what a Perſon hath done amiſs; and a ſincere " Amendment for the future. The ſecond Duty was, " That they would be *baptized, in the Name of Jeſus* " *Chriſt.* Which Baptiſm, recommended to, is, un- " undoubtedly, to be underſtood, The Baptiſm of " Water; foraſmuch as it was a *Duty injoined*; and is " what the Apoſtle doth *diſtinguiſh*, from the Baptiſm " of the Spirit; or Gift of the Holy Ghoſt: for this is " what he adds by Way of Promiſe. From hence it " is undeniably evident, that the *Baptiſm* here intended, " was that with *Water*; and therefore an Ordinance to " be ſubmitted to, by ſuch as would embrace Chriſti- " anity: it being what God, by the Apoſtle, did ſpe- " cially require; and that upon their being immediately

" en-

(a) Acts ii. 38.

" *endued with Power from on High.* Nay, it's what God, " by his Spirit, enjoined with *Repentance*; and there- " fore, who dares to separate or make it void? I say, " what Man hath Power to set aside that which God " (by his Spirit, after our Lord's Ascension) hath " joined together; and recommended to the Practice " of such as would be his Disciples and Followers? " But if those Things which are thus taught by the " Spirit of God, are not to be accounted *Gospel Duties*; " I would fain know what we are so to esteem? and by " what we may judge with more Safety, than by the " Direction of the *Spirit of Truth?* which, by the " Apostle, advised to the *Baptism* of *Water*; and assured " them of the Baptism of the *Holy Ghost:* and on which " Doctrine and Practice the Church of *Jerusalem* was " planted. And to be *baptized in the Name of Jesus* " *Christ*, doth signify a Belief in him and his Autho- " rity; and a yielding Obedience thereto in his Ordi- " nance, *calling on his Name*, thereby professing to be " a Disciple and Follower of Christ. From all which, " it doth appear, that *Water-Baptism*, is an Ordinance " of Christ; forasmuch, as it was that, which the " Apostle, by the immediate Influence of the *Spirit*, " directed the *Heart-prick'd Jews* unto; as their Duty to " obey: and that to be done *in the Name of Jesus* " *Christ.* And, indeed, one would think that this " Passage is so distinct and clear, that it might be suf- " ficient to convince any *sincere Enquirer*, that *Water-* " *Baptism* is a Gospel Ordinance. I say, from hence it " is evident, that *Water-Baptism*, is an Ordinance of " the Gospel; seeing the *endued* Apostle, required the " *Convicts*, to be baptized *in the Name of Jesus Christ:* " and that in order to, or as a Condition of, their re- " ceiving the *Holy Ghost:* So that the Baptism men- " tioned, cannot mean a Baptism with the *Holy Ghost*; " for that was to follow upon their being baptized; " and therefore it was not the same with it; so that " it's very clear, that the Apostle, intended *Water-Bap-*

" *tism.*

" *tism.* And it is also manifest, that it was the Duty " of the *Heart-prick'd Souls*, to submit thereto, in Obe- " dience to the pure *Gospel Ministry of Jesus Christ our* " *Lord.* Which accordingly we find many of them " did; and was that Day added to the Church."

In Answer to which, *Joseph Besse* says, *Exam.* p. 29. " WE shall next take Notice of the *Texts* produced by " the *Sermon-Writer*, to prove *Water-Baptism a Gospel* " *Ordinance.*" He then goes on saying, " The first of " which is *Acts* ii. 38. *Then* Peter *said unto them, Repent* " *and be baptized every one of you in the name of* THE " LORD *Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall* " *receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*

" This Text (*says he*) as WE have before observed, " (p. 12.) makes no Mention of Water; the Word " *Baptized* in this Place MAY well denote the cleans- " ing of the *Heart*, or Conversion of the Soul to God. " This Interpretation of the Word is such as the A- " postle *Peter* himself hath given it, in a *Text exactly* " *parallel* in the next Chapter, when speaking to the " People in *Solomon*'s Porch, he says, *Repent ye therefore* " *and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when* " *the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the* " *Lord.* Acts iii. 19. Wherefore this Author's intrud- " ing Water into a *Text*, which makes no Mention of " any, shews that he is wise beyond what is written, " and prefers his own Sense to the Apostle's Interpre- " tation,—by which it appears, that the two Duties " recommended to the Heart-pricked *Jews*, were, first, " REPENTANCE, and secondly, the *Conversion* of the " Heart to God; the Consequence of which would be " Remission of Sins and the Gift of the Holy Ghost, " or the *refreshing* of the Holy Spirit, the Comforter " which Christ had promised."——

But, here I can't well avoid observing, the Unfair- ness of my Opponent; who, tho' he stiles his *Piece* an *Exam. &c.* yet, has not so much as inserted the *Sum* of what I offer'd from *this Text*; altho' *this Text* is

what

what I moſt largely inſiſted on; which, is what I think he ought to have done; that ſo his Readers, might have been able, to have paſſed their Judgment on his *Examination, &c.* In ſhort, it appears to me, that *Joſeph*—had not a good Liking to it; and therefore might think, that it was his wiſeſt, and ſafeſt Way to confute it; while he kept his Readers ignorant what it was.

Now, here I remark firſt, that *Joſeph Beſſe*, does either contradict his *Title* Page, or elſe, applies *to himſelf*, the plural Number; for ſays he as above, "WE *ſhall next* "*take Notice of the Texts produced by the Sermon-Writer.*"—But with regard to the Author, as in the *Title Page*, it is, "*By* ONE *of the People called Quakers.*" I ſay, it's plain he contradicts himſelf;——and this farther appears p. 40. "WE (ſays he) apprehend that the Obſer-"vations we have made."—So alſo p. 41, 44. And, this is yet more clear, if, his *firſt*, *third*, *fourth*, and *fifth* Pages be obſerved; in which he as *Author* of the *Exam. &c.* often makes Uſe of the ſingular Number; as, *one*, *I*, *my*, *mine.*——Now theſe are only proper to or of a ſingle Perſon; and from thence, I think it's but reaſonable to conclude, that *Joſeph Beſſe* was THE *Author* of the *Examination*, *&c.* and if this be the Caſe, it plainly ſhews, when I obſerve, that he often ſays, WE, I ſay it ſhews, according to his Friend *R. Barclay*, *Apology*, p. 359. *that* Joſeph Beſſe, *is puff'd up with a* VAIN *Opinion of himſelf*; and that his giving the plural to himſelf, *proceeds from a high and proud Mind*, p. 361. And if we may judge, according to our *Saviour*'s Rule, who ſays, *that a Tree is known by his Fruit*; it appears by reading *Joſeph Beſſe*'s *Exam.* &c. that *R. Barclay* hath at this Time *hit* the Mark. I had not made a Remark on this, had it not been the *profeſs'd religious Principles of the Quakers*, to declare againſt the Uſe of a plural Phraſe, to or of a ſingle Perſon.

Secondly, but, how comes it to paſs, that *Joſeph*—thus takes the Liberty, to add the Words, THE LORD,

to

to the ſacred *Text*, Acts ii. 38. doth he not believe, that the Apoſtle *Peter*, was *filled with the Holy Ghoſt*; and that he *ſpake as the Spirit gave him Utterance*: Does he think, that he hath a greater *Gift* of the *Spirit*, than *Peter*? and that thereby, he could *mend*, and had *Authority*, to *add*, to the Words of the inſpired Apoſtle? Is not this being *wiſe* above what is *written*? may I not juſtly apply to him, his own Words to the *Vicar*, that "the im-"poſing *thoſe* Words is *an Addition* to the *Text*, and "altogether unneceſſary, unleſs Men are minded to, "EXALT THEMSELVES, by preferring their *own* "Mode of *Expreſſion* to ſuch as the *Holy Ghoſt* has "thought fit to uſe, p. 181."

Thirdly, as to his ſaying that *Acts* ii. 38. and Chap. iii. 19. are *exactly parallel*, and in particular, the Word, *Baptized*, and *Converted*, I ſay, as before to this, it's DENIED. And till theſe his *Premiſes*, are proved to be *true*, his Inference therefrom can be of no Weight. Beſides, let it be remembred, as before obſerved, that his *Friend J. Pike* allows *Acts* ii. 38. to intend *Water-Baptiſm*. And very expreſs, are the Words of *Tho. Ellwood* in his *Sacred Hiſtory*, p. 502. who ſays, "That the "Baptiſm here mentioned, was the Baptiſm of *John*,— "may be gathered from the *Terms* of it, *Repentance* "and *Remiſſion* of Sins, exactly agreeing with the Terms "of *John*'s Baptiſm, *Mark* i. 4."——Now, as *Joſeph Beſſe*, and the *Quakers*, allow, *John*'s Baptiſm, to be *Water-Baptiſm*, it is evident, that *Tho Ellwood* concludes; that, the Baptiſm here intended, is *Water-Baptiſm*. And indeed, it appears to me, that the *Perſon*, whom *W. Penn*, ver. 1. p. 894. ſtiles "that *Man of God* and "PRINCE *in Iſrael—George Fox*,"—I ſay, it appears to me, that HE does alſo allow the ſame: For he having cited, *Luke* xxiv. 47. *Acts* ii. 38.—*Acts* xxvi. 20. goes on ſaying, "Now here ye may ſee, that People "muſt *repent*, *before they do believe*, and are *baptized*; and "before they receive the *Holy Ghoſt*."——From hence, I think it's evident, that this *Great Man*, *G. Fox*, had

par-

particular Reference to *Acts* ii. 38. and also that he does plainly distinguish with the Apostle, the *Baptism* spoken of, from the Gift of the *Holy Ghost*: for the *Sum* of his Words, in short, I think may fairly be thus expressed; *that People must repent, before they—are baptized, and before they receive the Holy Ghost.* Now, what can be well plainer, than, that *George*—by the Baptism spoken of, understood one Thing; and by receiving the *Gift of the Holy Ghost* another: and therefore, with his *Friends Joseph Pike*, and *Tho. Elwood*, that it's *Water-Baptism* there intended. And surely, if *Joseph Besse*, would seriously consider, what his *Friends*, *Pike*, and *Elwood*, and that MAN OF GOD, *and* PRINCE *in* ISRAEL has said; he will (one would think) no longer oppose in this Point; especially, if he has any Value, or Regard, for the Words or Judgment, of these his *ancient, eminent*, and as *he supposes, divinely inspired Friends.*

And, as to his pretending that the Apostle, *Acts* ii. 38. did not intend *Water-Baptism*, because Water is not *express'd*, and, that so to understand it, *is a being wise beyond what is written*; I say as to this, it is so very trifling, and ridiculous, that it deserves no Answer: However, being willing to remove all his Scruples and Doubts, I shall answer, in the Words of his *own Friend J. Pike*, p. 101. where says he, "some have "been so VOID of CHARITY, as to insinuate, that "WE denied those *Texts* in the *Acts*, where Baptism is "mentioned, to mean *Water*, where *Water* is not *lite-* "*rally* named; which *(says he)* is really a GREAT "UNTRUTH." Compare, this with p. 80, 81, 82. where he plainly owns *Acts* ii. 38. to intend *Water-Baptism.*

And it's very like, that on the same Account, *Joseph Besse*, in his Answer to the *Vicar*, p. 287. does deny, that the Words of *Ananias* to *Paul*, did relate to, or was intended of *Water-Baptism*; I say, it's like he denies it because Water is not mentioned, *Acts* ix. 17, 18. and Chap. xxii. 16. in which last, the Apostle declares

more expreſly, what *Ananias* had ſaid to him as hinted at Chap. ix. 17, 18. which Words are, *And now, why tarrieſt thou? Ariſe and be baptized, and waſh away thy ſins, calling on the name of the Lord.* Now, tho' *Water* is not here *expreſſed*, yet, that *Ananias* intended *Water-Baptiſm*, is fully declared by *J. Pike*, p. 90. where he, ſpeaking with Reference to this *Text*, ſays, —— " As Water-" Baptiſm was then in Practice, and had been retained " under the Diſpenſation of *John* the *Baptiſt*, as were " many other *legal* Things; ſo *Ananias* ADVISED " *Paul* to be *baptized* therewith."——

From all which, I think it's but natural to inquire, what is become, of the ſo much talked of *Unity*, and *Oneneſs*, of the *Quakers!* But more of this in its Place.

And, from hence it's alſo evident, that *Joſeph Beſſe*'s Rule, for judging when a *Text* is to be underſtood, to relate to *Water-Baptiſm*, fails him; foraſmuch, as this *Text* according to his *Friend*, is meant of *Water-Baptiſm*; and yet, *Water* is not expreſſed. And, it's very like, *Joſeph* might have forgot, that he himſelf and his *Friends*, explain the *Baptiſm* mentioned, *Epheſ.* iv. 5. to mean *Spirit Baptiſm*; altho' it's not there ſo expreſſed: And yet, if ſo to underſtand it, *is to be wiſe beyond what is written*; who ſo wiſe in this Reſpect, as he and his *Friends?*

And p. 30. after *Joſeph*—has been ſpeaking as before is obſerved, he goes on, ſaying, " Seeing that *Remiſſion* " *of Sins and the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt*, are not the Conſe-" quence of *Water-Baptiſm*, 'tis evident that *Water-Bap-*" *tiſm* was not the Baptiſm enjoined in this *Text.*" But, can any Perſon beſides himſelf, ſee any Argument in this? for tho' *Remiſſion* of *Sins*, and the *Gift* of the *Holy Ghoſt* are not THE Conſequence of *Water-Baptiſm*, does that prove, that *Water-Baptiſm* was not enjoined in the *Text.* And, is there not a great Difference, between THE, Conſequence of any Thing, and a Promiſe, being annexed to it? as it is in this *Text*, to all that *repent* and are *baptized.*——And is *Joſeph Beſſe* ſo blind,

as

as not to see through this? or does he think that others are so? However, he goes on,—" From what hath " been said, WE apprehend it will clearly appear, that " this Author (*meaning me*) has no sufficient Warrant " from *Acts* ii. 38. to say, that the Apostle *advised* to " the *Baptism* of *Water*; nor any Authority from thence " to conclude, that *Water-Baptism* is a *Gospel Ordi-* " *nance.*"

Ans. What *Joseph*—may think a sufficient Warrant, I know not; but this I know, that it appears so to me; and according to his *Friends* as before cited; the Apostle did there advise to the *Baptism* of *Water*: And, as he was directed in his *Doctrine* by the Spirit of God; I think, it may be justly concluded, that, what the Apostle, in the Discharge of his *Gospel Ministry*, there recommended; ought to be *considered*, and *regarded*, as an *Ordinance thereof.* He proceeds, p. 31. and says, " The Drift and Tendency of the Ministry of the " Apostles was to publish to all Mankind *Remission of* " *Sins* thro' *Repentance* and FAITH in Jesus Christ."

Now as to this, I shall not dispute with him. But he goes on and says, " What they (*meaning the A-* " *postles*) declare to be the Consequence of FAITH, " this Author attributes to Water-Baptism."——

Ans. But with what Face, *Joseph*—could tell the World so; I know not; for certain I am, that in this, he was not dictated by the *Spirit* of *Truth*; since I have no where *attributed Remission* of *Sins*, to be *the Consequence of Water-Baptism*; which is what he does plainly here declare; and therefore, until he can make this appear to be true; *Falshood lyeth at his Door.*

And farther, as I have no where so declared, neither do I believe, *Remission of Sins* to be THE Consequence of *Water-Baptism.* And this, is what he could not (I think) but know; forasmuch, as he has, p. 10. of his *Exam. &c.* inserted my Answer to his *Friend*'s Question, which was to this Effect; " *Whether Persons might not*

" come under *Water-Baptiſm*, and other *External Forms*, " and yet be in a bad State?"

To which, I anſwered to this Purpoſe, that, " I did " think, that there was many that paſſed under the " *Externals* of *Religion*, and yet were in a very bad Con- " dition: and I inſtanced the Caſe of *Simon Magus*."—

Now, from hence it's evident, that I am far from concluding, that *Remiſſion of Sins*, is THE Conſequence of *Water-Baptiſm*. And, this I ſay again, *Joſeph*—could not but know; foraſmuch, as he has given the above Paſſage, a Place in his *Exam. &c.* And therefore, it's unaccountable to me, how he could take the Liberty, thus *falſly* to repreſent *me* to the World. But, tho' I do not believe, *Remiſſion of Sins*, to be THE Conſequence of *Water-Baptiſm*; yet, I conclude with the Apoſtle, that thoſe who—*repent, and be baptized*, (in Water,) *in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt*; ſhall, through the Mercy of God, in Chriſt, *receive the Remiſſion of Sins*; —as *Acts* ii. 38. and, what the Apoſtle *by the Dictates of the Holy Spirit*, hath thus joined together; the *Quakers* have no Authority, to ſeparate, or put aſunder.

And, farther, as I have not attributed *Remiſſion of Sins* to be THE Conſequence of *Water-Baptiſm*, his Inſinuation, or rather Declaration, on that Account; muſt ariſe from his own Imagination;—and, I think he might have deferred anſwering,—until, at leaſt, he had heard me on that Head. But, his Forwardneſs on this Account,—makes it very juſt, to apply the *Proverb* to him, *He that anſwereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and ſhame unto him.* Prov. xviii. 13. And therefore, I adviſe him when he writes again, to keep *more cloſe to his Buſineſs*;—to learn to be conſiſtent with himſelf; and to pay a better Regard to the Judgment of his *Friends*.

Now, what *mighty Feats Joſeph*—has done by his pretended *Examination*, &c. in ſhewing the Weakneſs, or Invalidity of my Argument, from *Acts* ii. 38. for *Water-*

Bap-

Baptiſm, I leave, to the Conſideration of the impartial Reader.

The next *Text* I took Notice of, in order to ſhew, that *Water-Baptiſm* is an Ordinance of the Goſpel Church; was *Acts* viii. 5, 12, 14, 15, 16, and 17. and from hence I obſerved, p. 20, 21. of mine on *Water-Baptiſm*; that, " We are told by the ſacred *Hiſtorian*, " that *Philip went down to the City of Samaria, and preached* " *Chriſt unto them*; that is, he not only ſhewed Chriſt " to be the Meſſiah and Son of God; but he alſo " *preached the Things concerning the Kingdom of God*; *and* " *the Name of Jeſus Chriſt.* Whereby the *Kingdom of* " *God*, I humbly conceive, is meant the Goſpel Diſpen- " ſation; and by *the Things* which *concerned that King-* " *dom*, the Duties of Chriſtianity; which when the " *Samaritans* believed, they were in Obedience thereto, " baptized both Men and Women. (*a*) Which Bap- " tiſm, is evident from the *Text*, to be the *Baptiſm of* " *Water*; and alſo one of thoſe Things which *Philip* " preached as appertaining *to the Kingdom of God*; which " the *Samaritans* were obedient to; and on the Account " of which (amongſt other Things at leaſt) they were " ſaid to have *received the Word of God:* (*b*) and yet " were not baptized with the Holy Ghoſt; tho' they " had, in Obedience to the WORD, been *baptized in* " *the Name of the Lord Jeſus.* (*c*) Would to God, that " all who deny the Practice of this Ordinance, would " ſeriouſly conſider of this; I ſay, that they would " conſider, that the *Believers* at *Samaria* in Conformity " to *Philip*'s preaching *the Things concerning the Kingdom* " *of God*, were baptized in *Water*, *in the Name of the* " *Lord Jeſus.*"

In Anſwer to which ſays *Joſeph Beſſe*, p. 31. " The " next *Text* which he produces in Proof that *Water-* " *Baptiſm is* an *Ordinance of Chriſt*, is *Acts* viii. 12. *when* " *they* (the Samaritans) *believed* Philip, *preaching the* " *Things*

(*a*) Acts viii. 12. (*b*) Acts viii. 14. (*c*) Ver. 15, 16.

" *Things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of* " *Jeſus Chriſt, they were baptized both Men and Women.* " This Baptiſm (ſays he, p. 21.) is evident from the " Text to be the Baptiſm of Water. Now ſuppoſe " that be granted him, yet it is as evident from the " Context, that the Baptiſm there ſpoken of was not " attended either with *Remiſſion of Sins*, or *the Gift of* " *the Holy Ghoſt*, and conſequently was not the *true* " *Chriſtian Baptiſm.*"

Anſ. Now, here I obſerve, firſt, that *Joſeph*—does not pretend to deny *Acts* viii. 12. to intend *Water-Baptiſm*; for ſays he, with reſpect to this *Text*, " *Now* " *ſuppoſe that be granted him.*"—But how much more *honeſt*, and *honourable*, would it have been, for him, freely to have own'd it; ſince he don't pretend to deny it: Is it not therefore plain, that he is willing to hide, or perplex the Truth?

Secondly, how can he tell, *that the Baptiſm there ſpoken of, was not attended with Remiſſion of Sins?* Does the *Spirit* in him, tell him ſo? If it does, I fear it's a *falſe one*; for tho' *Simon*'s *Sins* were not; yet, there is great Reaſon to think, that the others, *Sins* were *remitted*; who had *received, and obeyed the Word, preached* by *Philip*; as that they were thought, proper Perſons, by the Apoſtles; to pray to God for; that as they had *received the Word*; they might alſo receive, the *Holy Ghoſt*. And it's evident, that *God owned them* in an *extraordinary Manner*; by his beſtowing it ſo on them. Which, when it's conſidered, I think it's moſt reaſonable to conclude, that they were not in *Simon*'s Condition, viz. *in the Gall of Bitterneſs, and in the Bond of Iniquity*; but, rather ſuch, whoſe *Sins* were remitted; and they in the divine Favour.

But *Joſeph*—proceeds, ſaying,——" The Caſe of the " —*Samaritans* ſhews, how *little* they were *benefited* by " *Water-Baptiſm*, which, tho' ſaid to be *in the Name of* " *the Lord Jeſus*, was not accompanied with the *Gift* of " the Holy Ghoſt."——

Now

Now in Anſwer to this, I ſay, that, from his own Words, it's evident, that as *Water-Baptiſm*, was (adminiſtred) " *in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*," it's plain, that *Water-Baptiſm* was an *Ordinance of the Lord Jeſus*: tho' it was diſtinct, from the *Gift of the Holy Ghoſt*. And it's being ſo, makes it no leſs true, that it is *Chriſt's own Baptiſm*.

However, he goes on, and ſays,——" 'Tis plain, " that the formal Adminiſtration of that Ceremony " *availeth little*; and that Men may paſs under that " Ceremony without being baptized with the *Baptiſm of* " *Chriſt*."

Anſ. But, let *Joſeph*—ſhew if he can, that becauſe ſome were *baptized* with *Water*, and did not *immediately* thereupon, receive the *Gift* of the *Holy Ghoſt*; that therefore, it will follow, that *Water-Baptiſm*, is not the *Baptiſm of Chriſt*. And until he hath done this, his frequent talking in that Strain, is *meerly trifling*; and may be juſtly deemed *Sophiſtry*.

And to what Purpoſe, he talks ſo much of *Simon*, I ſee not; except, it be to ſhew, that *Water-Baptiſm*, is not an Ordinance of Chriſt; BECAUSE, ſuch wicked Perſons as *Simon*, might be in the Practice of it; and yet not be *benefited* by it. I ſay, unleſs, this be his End, I can't ſee why he ſo inſiſts on the *Caſe* of *Simon*; and argues on that Account, that *Water-Baptiſm* is not an *Ordinance of Chriſt*.——Some of his Words are, p. 31. " *The Caſe of* SIMON—*plainly ſhews, that Water-Baptiſm* " *is not the Baptiſm of Chriſt*."——

Now ſuppoſe I ſhould in another Caſe, argue in like Manner, That as *Joſeph Beſſe*, owns that the *Act of aſſembling* together for religious Worſhip, is *an External Ordinance to be obſerved under the Goſpel Diſpenſation*, as *Exam.* p. 8. will it follow, that becauſe too many join in the *Act of aſſembling*, together for *religious Worſhip*, and yet remain with *Simon in the Gall of Bitterneſs, and in the Bond of Iniquity*; I ſay, will it follow from thence, that the *Act of ſo aſſembling*,—is to be laid aſide; and

not

not considered, as an *External Ordinance*; to be practised under this Dispensation!

Again, had *Joseph*—lived under the *former Dispensation*, in which was injoin'd many *Rites* and *Ceremonies*; and he had observed some to be very *strict* in the Performance of those *Externals*,—would he have took upon himself, to have argued, that those *Rites*—were not injoined by divine Authority; because, there were some that observed them, and yet, were *wicked* and *ungodly* Persons! And farther, would it have followed, that because some *Jews* were not *benefited* which did observe those *Ceremonies*, whose *Hearts were not right with God*; that therefore, others, who came to those Services with well-prepared Minds, and did answer to the Requirings of God therein, would not be profited, by their sincere Obedience to him! Now, tho' too many, may come to *Water-Baptism* like *Simon*, with *unprepared Hearts*, and go away like him unprofited; yet it no Way appears from thence, that those who came to *Water-Baptism* with Hearts well disposed to God, by *Faith* and Repentance shall not be profited thereby; as it's one Part of their Duty in Obedience to him.

So also, with Regard to *Assembly Worship*; tho' too many may come to the *publick Worship* of God, like as *Simon*,—and go away like him unprofited,—yet, it will not follow from thence, that those who attend the—*Worship* of God as they ought to do, shall not be profited thereby.——Now, if *Joseph*'s thus arguing against the Continuance of *Water-Baptism*, be good;—the same of Course will follow, with respect to *Assembly Worship*; viz. it ought also to be laid aside.——But as *Joseph*—thinks the *Quakers* have sufficient Authority, for the Continuance of the *Act of so assembling together*;—so, in like Manner it's evident, that there is the same Authority for the Continuance, of *Water-Baptism*;—even, the Doctrine, and Practice, of the *commissioned, and inspired Apostles of Christ*.

He,

He, yet goes on, p. 31, 32. " It were *(says he)* to " be wiſhed that all who practice *Water-Baptiſm* would " ſeriouſly conſider of this; I ſay, that they would " ſeriouſly conſider that the *Samaritans*, notwithſtand- " ing their outward Aſſent to the Doctrine of *Philip*, " and their being *outwardly* baptized with *Water*, were " not eſteemed as *perfect Converts to Chriſtianity*, till they " were afterward *baptized* with the *Chriſtian Baptiſm* by " the Miniſtration of *Peter* and *John*, who, ver. 17. " *laid their Hands on them, and they received the Holy* " *Ghoſt.*"

Anſ. I find that *Joſeph*, is not only uncharitable in his Opinion of *me*, but alſo, I think, of the *Samaritans*; for what leſs by his Expreſſions, does he inſinuate, than that they were *Hypocrites* to *Philip*; by his talking of *their* OUTWARD *Aſſent, to the Doctrine of Philip:* Does not ſuch a Way of ſpeaking, ſignifie, as tho' he did not conclude, that the *Samaritans* did *inwardly*, or from the *Heart*, aſſent to, or obey *Philip*'s Doctrine; when they, were *baptized in Water?*

And, where does this Author, find this *Diſtinction*, in the *New Teſtament*, of *perfect Converts* to Chriſtianity; eſpecially, ſuch as are diſtinguiſhed, from thoſe that have received the *Word of God*; as theſe *Samaritans* had done?

However, it's plain as above, that according to *Joſeph*, the *Samaritans* did not only give their—Aſſent to the *Doctrine* of *Philip*, but hearing of him preach, *believed*, and were *baptized* in *Water*. From hence it's evident, that *Water-Baptiſm* was contained in the Doctrine which *Philip preached*; and, was alſo one of thoſe *Things* that *concerned the Kingdom of God*; *and the Name of Jeſus Chriſt.*——And conſequently, was an Ordinance of the *Goſpel Church.*

And farther, as it was adminiſtred *in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt*; by the *inſpired* Servant of God; it ſhews, that, *that Baptiſm*, was the *Baptiſm* of *Chriſt*. Therefore, I take the Liberty to ſay again,—Would to God, that

the *Quakers*, who deny the Practice of this Ordinance, would seriously consider of this; I say, that they would consider, That the *Believers* at *Samaria*, in Conformity to *Philip*'s preaching, *the Things concerning the Kingdom of God*, were *baptized in Water*; in the Name of the Lord Jesus. That so, they might by the Blessing of God, come to see the TRUTH: and be obedient to it.

Now, from the Whole, of what hath been said from *Acts* viii. 12,—14, 15, 16. I trust, that notwithstanding, what *Joseph Besse* hath produced, in his *Exam.* &c. yet, the Argument for *Water-Baptism*,—remains untouched: Nay, not only so; but when his *weak Examination*, is considered; together, with the *sacred Text*, it's abundantly more *conspicuous* or plain.

I next went on, in my Discourse of *Water-Baptism*, to observe, p. 21, 22. " That I *was informed*, that the Word IN, *(a)* the Name in this Text, " is, in the *Greek* or Original, INTO, as well as in " the *Commission* of our Lord, *(b)* where, on the " Account of which, Mr. *Barclay* and *Dell* declare, " *(c)* That Water is not intended, but the Baptism of " the Spirit; and therefore read or explain it thus; " *Go teach all Nations, and, by the Ministration of the* " *Spirit, baptize or dip them into the Name, &c.* That is, " say they, *into the Power and Vertue of God.* But let it " be observed, That this is none of the Spirit's *Dialect*, " in the Scriptures; that is, that the Apostles were " commanded to baptize Persons *into the Power and Ver-* " *tue of God.* Neither is the Phrase *Baptizing*, so to be " understood; when it is mentioned, as that which was " practised or to be performed by the Apostles; as is " the Case in the *Commission*: and therefore such a " Comment is not to be received. Besides, if the Word " INTO makes such a mighty Difference in the *Com-* " *mission*, to what it would if it was only to be con- " sider'd as our Translation renders it, that is, IN, and " that

(a) Acts viii. 16. *(b)* Mat. xxviii. 19. *(c)* Dell *on Baptism*, p. 30.

" that wherever it's INTO, in the Original, it must be " read and understood according to Mr. *Dell*, that when " Persons are ordered, or said to be baptized INTO " the Name of any, that the Meaning is, That they " are baptized *into their Power and Vertue:* I say, if so, " what confused Work shall we make of this Scripture, " which then would run thus; *Who when they were come* " *down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy* " *Ghost. For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only* " *they were baptized into the Power and Vertue of the Lord* " *Jesus.* (*a*) For then it will follow, That Persons may " be baptized *into the Power and Vertue of Christ*, and yet " not be *baptized* with the *Spirit* or *Holy Ghost.* So that " the natural Consequence of their Notion of the " Word INTO, doth, at least, very much perplex, if " not destroy their own Doctrine. Which I humbly " intreat those People seriously to consider of; that so " they may come to see their Mistake; and *the Truth as* " *it is in Jesus.*"

In Answer to which *Joseph*—says, *Exam.* p. 32, 33. " Tho' his Information, as to the Sameness of the " *Greek* Word in this Text, may be true; yet his own " Assertion respecting *Barclay* and *Dell*, is not so: For " altho' those Authors do declare, that in *Mat.* xxviii. " 19. *Water* is not intended, but the *Baptism of the* " *Spirit*, yet 'tis not *barely* on the Account of the Word, " *Into*, that they so declare: But 'tis on the Account " of the Nature of *Christ's Baptism*, which Christ him- " self distinguishes from the *Baptism of Water*; and be- " cause that when Christ had so clearly distinguished " between *John's Baptism of Water* and his own *Baptism* " *of the Spirit*, it must be absurd to suppose that his " Commission should relate to *Water-Baptism*, which " was that of *John.* And that Water-Baptism was " not intended in *Christ's Commission* to his Disciples, is " apparent by their being commanded to wait for

 " Power

(*a*) Acts viii. 15, 16.

" Power from on high to execute it: For this Author " has acknowledged, p. 11. *that Water-Baptiſm is in* " *Man's Power only to adminiſter.* What Need then " could there be for their waiting to be *endued with* " *Power from on high*, to qualify them to *baptize* with " ſuch a *Baptiſm* as was before in their own Power to " adminiſter ?"

Now, here I obſerve, that *Joſeph* does in effect own the Sameneſs of the *Greek* Word, *(Into)* in this *Text*, with that *Mat.* xxviii. 19. I alſo take Notice, that he declares, my *Aſſertion* reſpecting *Barclay* and *Dell*, is not *true*, when I ſaid, that on the Account of the *Greek* Word INTO, *Mat.* xxviii. 19. they declare, *that Water is not intended in the Commiſſion, but the Baptiſm of the Spirit*;——but, who is nigheſt the *Truth* in this, I truſt will appear anon, by thoſe Authors own Words. But firſt, where have I ſaid, that *'tis barely* on the Account of the Word *Into?* this is plainly an *Evaſion* of my Words; in order to put on a Colour of Advantage! but *Joſeph*, this unfair Way of Proceeding, ſhall not *ſcreen thee.* However, I obſerve, by his ſaying that *'tis not barely*,——that, he allows, it was on that Account, in ſome Meaſure; ſo that what I have ſaid in this Caſe, is *Truth*, by his own Words; notwithſtanding what he ſays to the contrary.

And with Regard to *R. Barclay* in this Point, thus he ſpeaks, *Apology*, p. 294. " Secondly as to what Chriſt " ſaith, in commanding them to be baptized *in the Name* " *of the Father, Son and Spirit.* I confeſs (ſays he) that " ſtates the Difference, and it is great;——FOR the " *Greek* is (-----) that is, INTO the *Name.* Now " the *Name of the Lord* is often taken in Scripture for " ſomething elſe, than a Sound of Words,——even for " his *Vertue* and *Power.*"——He goes on largely, in order to ſhew, that, on the Account of its being *Into*, in the *Commiſſion*, the Baptiſm there ſpoken of is not *Water-Baptiſm*, but a being baptized, INTO the *Vertue* and *Power* of God.

And

And *Dell*, in his Doctrine of *Baptisms*, p. 30. says,—" *Go teach all Nations*, and by the Ministration of the " Spirit,—dip them INTO the *Name of God the Father*, " *Son and Spirit*; and NOTE, that he saith not here, " (-----) in the Name, *But* INTO the Name of the " Father, *&c.* and by *the Name of God*, is meant the " *Power* and *Vertue* of God, or God himself; SO that " the Sence lies thus, " Teach the Nations, and bap- " tize them INTO the Name, *&c.*"

Now, whether I have wronged these *Authors*, I leave to the Judgment of the Reader. For, I think it's very plain, that it is on the Account of the *Greek* Word *Into*, —that *Barclay* and *Dell*, would fain exclude *Water* from being intended in the *Commission* of our Lord. And, that the *Quakers* in common, would exclude *Water* out of this *Text*, on Account of the *Greek* Word INTO, is I think, well known to many, that have had Conversation with them. That, when any have gone about to prove, from *Mat.* xxviii. 19, 20. that *Water-Baptism*, is the Baptism that Christ gave his Apostles in *Commission*; the *Quakers* commonly, will very *pertly* reply, and say, that's not so, FOR the *Greek* Word is *Into*, &c.

From all which, I think it's very manifest, that, these *Authors*, and the *Quakers*, would on Account of the *Greek*,—exclude *Water* out of our Lord's *Commission*. So, that the *confused* Work and *Perplexity*; which I observed as above, is a just Remark; and worthy the *serious Reflection* of the *Quakers*.

And farther, I observe he says,—" that *Water-Bap-* " *tism* was not intended in Christ's *Commission* to his " Disciples, is apparent by their being commanded to " *wait* for *Power* from on high to execute it."

But this I take the Liberty to deny; and let *Joseph* produce the *Text* if he can, wherein it's expressed, or declared, that the *Disciples* were to *wait* at *Jerusalem* for *Power, to execute*, or administer *Spirit-Baptism*; and until he can do this, I shall not take his *bare* Say-so, to be authentick:—especially, as the New Testament intimates

mates what it was, that they were to *execute*, by that *Power*, they were to wait for; and mentions nothing of their being impowered to *baptize* with the *Spirit*. For that was the peculiar *Gift of God*, and was the ſubject Matter the Apoſtles prayed to God for; that the *Believers* at *Samaria*, might receive. *Acts* viii. 15.—And it's plain, that it was for *Power*, to *execute* the Work of the *Miniſtry*, that they were to *wait* for, at *Jeruſalem*; that ſo they might be well accompliſhed, to *preach* the Goſpel; or to *be Witneſſes unto* Chriſt, *both in Jeruſalem, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermoſt Parts of the Earth.* Acts i. 5,—8. which they were compleatly qualified to do; when on the Day of *Penticoſt*, they received *Power*, or the *Gift of Tongues*,—Acts ii.—and this was the *Power* they *waited* for; that ſo they might be qualified, according to Chriſt's *Commiſſion*, to *teach all Nations*; and preach the Goſpel intelligibly, to the different Languages of the World.——

He proceeds, and cites a Sentence of mine, " that " *Water-Baptiſm* is *in Man's Power only to adminiſter.*" And then goes on ſaying, " What Need then, could " there be for their waiting to be *endued with Power* " *from on high*, to qualify them to *baptize* with ſuch a " Baptiſm as was before in their own Power to ad- " miniſter?

Now with Reſpect to the firſt, I would ask *Joſeph Beſſe*, whether it's in Man's *Power* to baptize with the *Spirit?* which if not; then what I have ſaid, as above, muſt be allowed for *Truth*. And agreeable hereto, ſays the enlightened Mr. *Dell*, (as *Joſeph* is pleaſed to call him) p. 18.—" *the Creature could but baptize with the* " *Creature*;"——and I hope *Joſeph* will not deny, what this his enlightened *Friend* hath ſaid.

And as to the ſecond, I ſay, I do not conclude, that the Diſciples were to *wait* at *Jeruſalem*, for any new, or additional *bodily* Strength; but as before obſerved, for the *inward Endowment* of the Soul;—together, with *Power* or Authority, to go out into the *Nations* of the World,

World, to *preach* the *Goſpel*; and *baptize*, ſuch as ſhould receive their Doctrine; which large, and extended Authority, they had not before.

P. 33. *He* adds, " Thoſe Authors, who probably " were as learned as this Writer's Informer, were not " ignorant, that the ſame *Greek* Word may be render- " ed *in* or *into*, alſo *to*, *for*, *by*, *at*, &c. according as the " Scope and Purport of the Text in which it is uſed " may require. And accordingly, they having proved " that *Mat.* xxviii. 19. muſt be underſtood of the *Bap-* " *tiſm of the* Spirit; they ſhew that the *Greek* Word in " that Text ought to be rendered *into*, but they no " where ſay, that *wherever the ſame Word occurs* " *in the* " *Original, it muſt be underſtood* the ſame Way." That " is only an imaginary Conſequence of this *Sermon-* " *Writer*'s own drawing, which he introduces with an " IF So, p. 22. and which indeed is NOT So. Let " him again conſult his Informer, and if he underſtands " the Original, he will probably ſatisfy him, that the " ſame Particle in the *Greek* Tongue may have a dif- " ferent Conſtruction in different Texts, agreeable to " the Diverſity of the Subject treated on. The Igno- " rance of which has led this Author to conceive a Ne- " ceſſity of ſuch a Method of Tranſlation as neither is " nor ought to be practiſed."

To which I ſay, It's allowed, that the *Greek* Word may be render'd *In*, or *Into*,—according to the Scope and Purport of the Text.—But, I deny, that thoſe *Authors* have proved that *Mat.* xxviii. 19. *muſt be underſtood of the Baptiſm of the Spirit*. However, if they had ſo done before him, it's but an eaſy Task, for *Joſeph*, to do ſo likewiſe; for he ſeems to have a mighty *Knack* of uſing the Works of others, made ready to his *Hand*.

But farther, I obſerve, that *he* here *cites* me *partially*; and thereupon miſrepreſents me as uſing the Word, *Wherever* without Limitation; as tho' I had ſaid, that WHEREVER *the ſame Word* (viz. Into) *occurs in the Original, it muſt be underſtood the ſame Way*;——when it's

it's undeniably plain, that I reſtricted thoſe *Terms*, to ſuch Paſſages of Scripture; *where Perſons are ordered, or ſaid to be baptized* INTO *the Name of any*;——ſo that *Joſeph*'s Inſinuation, is very *unjuſt*. And, tho' I do not underſtand *Greek*; yet, I can diſcern, when I am *well*, or *ill treated*.

But, this is not the firſt Time, that *he* has endeavour'd *falſly*, to repreſent my Words; a *Specimen* of it appears in his 16th Page, where *he* would inſinuate, as tho' I had ſaid, that ſomething might "*be Mans Duty, which* "*is not diſcoverable to his Reaſon to be ſo.*" And this he would *fain* make appear; becauſe, in mine on Water-Baptiſm, p. 9. ſpeaking of *Water-Baptiſm*, I ſaid, "the "Knowledge of which, to be a Duty under this Diſ-"penſation, depends——on the *New Teſtament*, it being "not to be known by the Light of Nature, or Reaſon "of Mankind; but from the Doctrine and Practice of "Chriſt, and his inſpired Apoſtles."——Now, whether the above Inſinuation be *juſt*, or *very unjuſt*, I leave to the impartial Reader. For it's very plain, that I was there obſerving, that tho' *Water-Baptiſm*'s being a Duty, could not *be known by the Light of Nature, or Reaſon of Mankind*; yet, I there obſerved, that it was diſcoverable to his Reaſon, to be a Duty; and that by the *Doctrine*, and *Practice* of *Chriſt*; and his *inſpired* Apoſtles. And yet, this is what *Joſeph* would very *fain*, and, hath took Pains to repreſent me as denying! O, *Joſeph*, mayeſt thou not juſtly *bluſh*, and be *aſhamed*, of theſe thy Actions! does that *Spirit*, thou pretends to be *guided* by, *lead* thee to this? Remember, ſuch Actions proceed not from the good *Spirit*. And I think, it's not at all amiſs, to adviſe him, before he writes again on *religious* Subjects; to go to the *School* of common *Civility!*

The next Paſſage I proceed to, p. 22, 23. was that of *Philip*'s being ſent to meet the *Ethiopian Eunuch*, Acts viii.—where we have an Account of the Succeſs of *Philip*'s Journey, and the *Converſion*, of the *Eunuch* to Chriſtianity;——on which Paſſage I obſerved,—That "We

"find

" find that the Spirit bid *Philip go near and join himſelf* " *to the Chariot*; which he diligently obeyed; and was " ſoon bid by the *Eunuch*, to come and ſit with him; " which accordingly he did; and there he had a good " Opportunity to *preach Chriſt* to him; as he had done " before to the *Samaritans*; and with the like Effect; " for we read, That *as they went on their Way, they came* " *unto a certain Water: and the Eunuch ſaid, See here is* " *Water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip* " *ſaid, if thou believeſt with all thine Heart, thou mayeſt.* " *And he anſwered and ſaid, I believe that Jeſus Chriſt is* " *the Son of God.* And then, we find, *he commanded the* " *Chariot to ſtand ſtill: and they both went down into the* " *Water, both Philip and the Eunuch; and he baptized him.* " (*a*) From hence it's very natural to obſerve, firſt, " That *Philip* had not only been preaching Chriſt to " be the true *Meſſiah*; but had alſo laid before the *Eunuch* " thoſe Things that *concerned his Kingdom.* Secondly, " That the Conſequence of *Philip*'s thus preaching, was " the *Eunuch*'s propoſing, and being accordingly, *baptized* " in *Water.* Thirdly, That all this was carried on and " conducted by the *Angel* and *Spirit* of God; and ended " in the Joy and *Rejoicing* of the *Eunuch.* Fourthly, " That *Faith*, or *Believing* in Chriſt, is a neceſſary " Qualification for the Subjects of *Water-Baptiſm*; which " ſhews, That the Baptiſm is an Ordinance of Chriſt; " ſince it's the *Believers* in him, only are the proper " Subjects of it: For if it had not been an Ordinance " of Chriſt, *Faith* in a dead and riſen Jeſus (I think) " would not have been required of Perſons in order to " it: and therefore, it's evident to be an Ordinance of " Chriſt."

In Anſwer to which, *Joſeph*, by his *Exam. &c.* has produced a wonderful Paragraph indeed; not only for its Length, (which makes it proper to divide it) but much more ſo, by the ſurprizing Contents thereof:

(*a*) Acts viii. 36, 37, 38.

which runs thus, p. 34. " The next Text produced by " this *Sermon-Writer*, is *Acts* viii. 32, 33. relating the " Paſſage of *Philip*'s baptizing the *Ethiopian Eunuch*. " From which Paſſage it were more eaſy to demon- " ſtrate, that *Water-Baptiſm* was a *Jewiſh Rite*, than it " is an *Ordinance* of the *Goſpel*. The Text itſelf clearly " ſhews that this Baptiſm was adminiſtred at the In- " ſtance and Requeſt of the *Eunuch*, who was a *Gentile*; " and the firſt Convert to Chriſtianity from among the " *Gentiles*, that we read of. He probably knowing " *Water-Baptiſm* to be a Rite or Ceremony uſed in order " to an Admiſſion into the *Jewiſh* Church, within the " Limits of which all the *Chriſtians* at that Time ſeem " to have been included, might deſire to be ſo baptized: " And for the ſame Reaſon *Philip*, being himſelf a " Member of the *Jewiſh* Church, might adminiſter that " Ceremony to gratify the Requeſt of his new Convert, " For it doth not appear that there was at that Time " any *Chriſtian* Church wholly diſtinct or ſeparate from " the Jewiſh. So that *Philip*'s adminiſtring to the *Eu-* " *nuch* at his Requeſt an uſual *Jewiſh* Ceremony, in or- " der to his Admiſſion into that Church of which *Philip* " himſelf and all other *Chriſtians* at that Time were " Members, doth in no wiſe prove *Water-Baptiſm* to be " an *Ordinance of Chriſt*."

Anſ. As, I have but a little before, adviſed him to learn *Common Civility*; ſo here I think I may juſtly caution him, to *read* the *Acts* of the Apoſtles with more *Care* and *Attention*; than, it appears, he hath heretofore done: For if he was not a Stranger to that *ſacred Book*, how could he ſay, that,—" it doth *not* appear that " there was at THAT TIME any *Chriſtian Church* " *wholly diſtinct* or *ſeparate* from the *Jewiſh*."

But in order that I may *convince* him of his *Error*; I ſhall have Recourſe to the *Acts* of the Apoſtles; from whence, I truſt it will appear, that there was at *that Time* a *Chriſtian Church*, *wholly diſtinct or ſeparate from the Jewiſh*; before the *Eunuch* was *baptized*. But firſt, I think

think it proper, to insert *R. Barclay's Definition of a Church*, that so it may be known what the *Quakers* conclude a *Church* to be. *Apology*, p. 181. " The Church " being no other Thing, *(says he)* but the *Society, Ga-* " *thering, or Company of such as God hath called out of* " *the World, and worldly Spirit, to walk in his* LIGHT *and* " *Life.*"

Now, were not the Apostles—such a *Society*, or *Company*; did they not *gather* or *assemble together*; as *Acts* i. 4, 13, 14. where the Apostles are named, and the *sacred Historian* goes on saying, *These all continued with one Accord in Prayer and Supplication, with the Women, and Mary the Mother of Jesus, and with his Brethren.* And in the next *Verse* we are told, that, *The Number of the Names together were about an Hundred and Twenty.* And this—*Company*, was that *Society*, which is called the CHURCH, to which there was some *daily added, as should be saved.* Acts ii. 47.

Now, was not this *Company,—wholly distinct and separated*, from the *Church*, and Worship of the *Jews?* had they not *separated* themselves from the *untoward* Men of that *Generation*, who *denied* Christ? were, they not *such, as God, had called out of the World*; to walk in his *Light?* And were not they such, as *continued stedfast in the Apostles Doctrine and Fellowship, and in breaking of Bread, and in Prayers?* And therefore were not they then in a proper Sense, the *Christian Church?* And was not this before *Philip* baptized the *Eunuch?* And agreeable hereto, it's said the *Apostles* went to *their own Company.* Acts iv. 23. And this Company is called *the Church*, Acts v. 11. And this was the *Christian Church*, which Multitudes of the *Jewish Church* came to; and joined themselves with, *ver.* 14. And, has *Joseph Besse*, so devoted himself, to the reading of his *Friends* Books, as to neglect, or at least, to be so unmindful; of what he reads in the *New Testament*, as NOT to know, that there was any *Christian Church*; properly *distinct* from the *Jewish Church*; till after the Baptism of the *Eunuch!* Did he never read *Acts*

viii. 1. how, that *Saul* was consenting to the Death of *Stephen, and that at that* TIME *there was a great Persecution against the* CHURCH *which was at Jerusalem?*——Is any Thing plainer than this, in all the New-Testament? No wonder, that *Joseph* can't find a sufficient Authority there, for *Water-Baptism*; when he can't find, that there was a *Christian Church, wholly distinct or separate from the Jewish Church*; 'till after the *Eunuch*'s Baptism!

But, perhaps *He* may not so much regard the *sacred Historian*, as he may his *Friend Elwood*'s sacred History; and therefore, I will cite some Passages from thence, to convince him of his Mistake. P. 523. on *Acts* 5. he says, "The *Christian Church* was by this Time grown some-"what *bulky*, by the plentiful Accession of *Converts* to "it." P. 524. he takes Notice of the "Care and "Service of providing Necessaries, and of distributing "them to the *whole Community*." P. 526. he speaks of a private Act of the *Church*, and p. 534. on *Acts* ii. 3. he says, speaking of *Saul*, "that he made Havock of "the CHURCH: not only molesting them in their "PUBLICK MEETINGS, but even following them "Home, and entering into every House, haled out "both Men and Women, and committed them to "Prison."

Now, can any Thing be well plainer, than, that there was at *that Time*, a *Christian Church*, wholly distinct,—from the *Jewish?* is it not evident from the *Christians* providing for the *Wants* of the *Poor*, that was amongst them; and from their making a private Act, *viz.* chusing Deacons, for the Well-being of the *Society*; and also from their being *persecuted* by the *Jewish Church*: And lastly, by their adhering to the *Apostles Doctrine*.—— And, can *Joseph Besse* shew, that the *Quakers* Church, is now, more *wholly distinct*,—from the *Established Church of England*, than was the *Christian Church* then, from the *Jewish*.——From what has been said, I think it must appear, very *weak* in *Joseph*, nay *ridiculous*, for him to talk of *Philip*'s admitting the *Eunuch* into the *Jewish Church*;

Church; by that Baptiſm, of which *Faith in Chriſt*, was a *neceſſary Qualification!* as *Acts* viii. 37.—And farther, as there was a *Chriſtian Church* diſtinct, from the *Jewiſh*; and *Philip* did by the Rite of *Water-Baptiſm*, admit the *Eunuch* into the *Society*, of Chriſtians, or into the *Chriſtian Church*; it's evident, that, that *Baptiſm* is an *Ordinance of Chriſt.*

Again, is it not very ſtrange, that HE ſhould alſo call *Philip* then, a *Member* of the *Jewiſh Church*; when that Church, on account of his departing from it, perſecuted him; and when *Philip* was engaged, in bringing as many *Converts* from the *Jewiſh*, to the *Chriſtian Church* as poſſible he could!

I had not, been thus large on this, had it not been a *String*, which *Joſeph* is very apt, to *harp* upon.

But, from hence we may ſee, what Abſurdities theſe Men run into; as well as Contradictions, one to another; notwithſtanding their *high Pretentions*, to be *led* by the *Spirit* of God. But, let *Joſeph* and all the *Quakers* know; that *God is not the Author of* ſuch *Confuſion*; *but of Peace.*

And, farther, I obſerve, he pretends that *Water-Baptiſm*, was, " *a Rite or Ceremony uſed by the Jews in order to* " *an Admiſſion into the Jewiſh Church.*"——

Now, by *Water-Baptiſm* here, if he means any Thing to his Purpoſe, he muſt intend, that *Baptiſm* which *John* adminiſtred; or that which the Apoſtles practiſed; both which I deny, was in Uſe before *John.*——And agreeable hereto are the Words of the *enlighten'd Dell*, in his Doctrine of Baptiſms, p. 13. where ſays he, " — the " *Baptiſm* of *John* was brought in *beſides* the Rites and " Manner of the *Law*, and ſo was a Sign of a great " Change to follow."—And p. 13, 14. he ſays,—" *John* " was the Author or FIRST Miniſter of a NEW and " *unwonted Baptiſm.*"——P. 6. ſpeaking of *John* and his Office, ſays, " he begins to ſhew the Difference from " thence, becauſe the NEWNESS of his *Baptiſm* was " the Occaſion of the Peoples conceiving, that he was " the *Meſſiah*;"——And with this agree the Words

of

of *W. Pen*, ver. 2. p. 832. " The Apoſtle *Peter* (*ſays* " *he*) did but continue a Practice, INTRODUCED " by *John*, not eaſily left among a ceremonious People." ——Now, from hence it's evident, if we are to pay Regard to theſe Authors, viz. *Dell*, and *Pen*, that the *Baptiſm* practiſed by *John*, and the *Apoſtles*, was not a *Jewiſh Ceremony*; but a Baptiſm *introduced*, or brought in by *John*; and was a *new*, and *unwonted Baptiſm*. And therefore, as *Joſeph* owns it to be a *Rite* of *Admiſſion*,—it's evident, it was not into the *Jewiſh*, but into the *Chriſtian Church*: and of Courſe an Ordinance thereof.

And, it's to be obſerved, that, ſuppoſing the *Jews* had a *Rite* of *Waſhing*, or *Baptizing*,—in Uſe among them, for the admitting *Proſelytes*, and their Children, into their *Church*; and likewiſe of Children of the *Gentiles* found;——I ſay, ſuppoſe it were ſo, yet, that *Waſhing*, was only to ſuch as above;—and was not practiſed to the Deſcendents of the *Jews*. But it's evident, that the Baptiſm of *John*, and of the *Apoſtles*, was practiſed to the *Jews themſelves*; as well as to the *Gentiles*; and therefore, it's manifeſt, that that Baptiſm, was different, or, another Thing, than the ſuppoſed *Baptiſm*, or *waſhing* of the *Jews*. For, as *Baptiſm* was practiſed by *John*, it was in the *Belief* of the *Meſſiah* to come; *Acts* xix. 3, 4. And as it was adminiſtred by the Apoſtles, it was an *initial* Rite, into the Chriſtian Church; and *Faith* in *Chriſt* as already come,—was a neceſſary Qualification for that *Ordinance*.

Now, as *Philip* had preached *Chriſt* to the *Eunuch*, and the *Eunuch* thereupon propoſed to be *baptized*, I think, it's but very natural to conclude, that *Philip* in preaching to *him Jeſus*, did preach Baptiſm to the *Eunuch*; and that thereupon, the *Eunuch*, as a *proſelyte* to Chriſtianity, cries out, *See here is Water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip ſaid, If thou believeſt with all thine Heart, thou mayeſt. And he anſwered and ſaid, I believe that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God.* Thus we find, that

Faith

Faith in *Chriſt*, was a *Prerequiſite* to *Water-Baptiſm*: and alſo, on that Confeſſion of *Faith*, they went *down into the Water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him.* Acts viii. 35, 36, 37, 38.—And therefore, I think, it's far from *a forced*, nay, it's but a very *natural Conſtruction*, to conclude, that as *Philip* had been preaching to the *Eunuch*, he had in his Doctrine, not only preached concerning the *Perſon* of our *Lord*; but alſo, had laid before him *thoſe Things which did concern his Kingdom*: For we find, not only that the *Eunuch*, came to *believe Chriſt to be the Son of God*; but alſo made this *Confeſſion of Faith*, in *Chriſt*, in ORDER for Permiſſion to be *baptized*. And therefore, nothing can well be plainer, than that *Philip*, had preached *Water-Baptiſm*, to the *Eunuch*. But, my Antagoniſt, goes on *multiplying* Words, tho' to little Purpoſe; for unleſs, he can (contrary to the expreſs Words of the *Text*,) ſhew, that this was not *Water-Baptiſm*; and that *Faith in Chriſt*, was not required of the *Eunuch*, as a previous Qualification for IT, all that he has farther ſaid on this, is but meer trifling; and nothing to his Purpoſe.

However, I will take Notice of ſome Things farther, in this remarkable Paragraph; he ſays,—" the Conſe-" quence of *Philip*'s preaching was the *Eunuch*'s believ-" ing in Jeſus whom *Philip* had preached unto him: " His being *baptized* in *Water* was *purely* at his own Re-" queſt."

But, how does *Joſeph* know, that it was *purely*, at the *Eunuch*'s Requeſt; that *Philip baptized* him in *Water?* can *he* certainly tell, that *Philip* did *not preach* it to him? If *he* cannot, it's groundleſs for *him*, to ſay, that the *Eunuch*'s being *baptized in Water*, was *purely* at his own Requeſt.——

And, how came *Joſeph* to know, that it was the Conſequence of *Philip*'s Preaching, that the *Eunuch* came to believe in *Jeſus*,—but as he finds it recorded? and therefore, it being alſo recorded, that the *Eunuch*'s *Baptiſm* follow'd *Philip*'s *Preaching*, we may likewiſe conclude,

clude, it was contained in his *Doctrine*: Especially, when we consider, that *Faith in Christ*, was required of the *Eunuch*, as a previous Qualification, in order to his Admission to that *Baptism*. For if he had not *believed on the Lord Jesus, with all his Heart*; it's plain, he had not been admitted to that *Ordinance*.

He proceeds saying, "the *Text* makes no mention "that the *Angel* or *Spirit of God* gave any Directions "concerning the baptizing the *Eunuch* with Water."

Now, by this *Joseph* would fain insinuate, that *Philip* had said nothing to the *Eunuch* concerning *Water-Baptism*.

But, if this be of any Weight, it will also follow, that *Philip* had not said any Thing to the *Eunuch* concerning *Christ*; for the *Text*, makes no mention, *that the Angel or Spirit of God, gave any Directions concerning that neither*.

But, we find, that *Philip* did *preach Christ*, and that the Effect thereof, was, that the *Eunuch* came to believe in Christ; and thereupon, according to his *Faith* in *Christ*, was *baptized*.

And when *Acts* viii. 5, 12, 14, 15, and 16.—is compared with Verses 35, 36, 37, and 38.—we may have a good *Idea*, or Conception of *Philip*'s—*Baptism*. For, *first*, we find, before he *baptizeth*, he preaches *Christ Jesus*. *Secondly*, when those to whom he preached did believe, or receive his Doctrine, he then admitted them to *Baptism*. *Thirdly*, we find, that in order to administer this Baptism, he goes down into the *Water*; with the Person to be *baptized*. And that this *Baptism* was administer'd, *in the Name of the Lord Jesus*.

Now, can *Joseph Besse* prove, that the *Jews*, in order to make *Proselytes* to their *Religion* and *Church*; did first *preach Christ*.—And when this their Doctrine was received, did, with their *Proselyte* go down into the Water; and there *dip* or *baptize* them; *in the Name of the Lord Jesus*. Which if he cannot do, his pretending p. 34.—that the Baptism which *Philip* administered to the *Eunuch*,

Eunuch, was an *uſual Jewiſh Ceremony*, is no leſs than downright *Sophiſtry*. But by this, we may plainly ſee, what pitiful *Shifts*, Men are drove to, that would exclude *Water-Baptiſm*, from appertaining to the *Goſpel of Chriſt*.

I will now proceed, to what ſeems to be his *grand* Argument; in which I ſuppoſe, he thinks, he has given a Reaſon, for excluding, *Water-Baptiſm!* His Words are, p. 35, 36. " 'Twas Cauſe to the *Eunuch* of Re-" joycing that he was by *Water-Baptiſm* become a Mem-" ber of the *Jewiſh* Church as other Chriſtians then " were, FOR the TEMPLE and Worſhip of the *Jews* " was STILL in being."——

Anſ. That the *Eunuch*'s believing in *Chriſt*, was Matter to him of *Rejoycing*, is allowed; but, that the *Eunuch* was by this *Baptiſm*, become a *Member* of the *Jewiſh Church*, is denied; and *Joſeph* muſt give ſome better Argument for it, than yet he hath done, before that will be admitted. For, tho' it's owned, that the *Temple* and *Worſhip* of the *Jews* was then in being; yet, that will not prove, that *Philip* the *Chriſtian Miniſter*, did by that *Baptiſm*, introduce, or initiate the *Eunuch* a *Member* into the *Jewiſh Church!* when at the ſame Time, there was, and had for ſome Time been, a *Chriſtian Church*. Is this a *Specimen*, of the *great Abilities* of *Joſeph Beſſe?* that I have ſo much heard of!

Does he ſuppoſe, that the *Jews*, would have perſecuted *Philip*, if *Philip*, was thus employ'd, in bringing *Members* to their *Church?* O! what Confuſion, and Perplexities attend, when Men miſs the *Truth*; and go about to ſet up, or endeavour to maintain falſe Doctrines!

But, can any beſides *Joſeph*,—ſee the Juſtneſs, of this Inference; that *becauſe* the *Temple* and *Worſhip* of the *Jews* was then in being, that therefore it will appear, that the *Eunuch*, by *Philip*'s baptizing him, became a *Member* of the *Jewiſh Church!*

For, after this Rate, there was none admitted, nay, no *Chriſtian Church*, for any to be admitted into, till after the Deſtruction of the *Temple*; and End of the *Jewiſh Worſhip!* which, according to *Ellwood*'s Sacred Hiſtory, p. 365. was about *forty Years* after *Chriſt*.

Again, how wrong is it for him thus to ſuggeſt; that the *Eunuch*'s—*Rejoycing*, was alſo, on account that he was by *Water-Baptiſm*, made a *Member* of the *Jewiſh Church*; when, according to his FRIEND *Tho. Ellwood*, —" he HAD been *baptized*, or *waſhed* in Water when " he was *proſelyted* to the *Jewiſh* Religion." *Sacred Hiſtory*, vol. iii. p. 541. So that, this could be no Cauſe for him to rejoyce, if, he by *Philip*'s adminiſtring *Water-Baptiſm* to him, was made a *Member* of the *Jewiſh Church*; ſince, according to *Tho. Ellwood*, he was by *Baptiſm*, or *Waſhing*, made a *Member* of that *Church* before. From hence, I think it's evident, that the Ground of the *Eunuch*'s Rejoycing, was not only, becauſe, that he by *Philip*'s preaching came to *believe* in *Chriſt*; but alſo, becauſe that he by *Water-Baptiſm*, was then initiated into the *Chriſtian Church*.

Now, can any that reads, and gives Credit to the *Acts* of the Apoſtles, receive *Joſeph*'s--Doctrine for Truth? for, according thereto, the *Apoſtles*, and the *Diſciples*; that were before the Deſtruction of the *Temple*; were notwithſtanding, their being baptized with the *Spirit*, as well as with *Water*; yet Members of the *Jewiſh Church!* From hence, agreeable to *him*, I think it will follow; that thoſe *Jews*, who we have an Account, were according to *his Friends baptized* with *Water*, Acts ii.——were by that *Baptiſm initiated* into the *Jewiſh Church*; of which they were *Members* before! And, that when it's ſaid, that *the Lord added to the Church daily ſuch as ſhould be ſaved*, Acts ii. 47. that, they were added to that *Church*, which they were *Members* of before! So when it's ſaid that there *was a great Perſecution againſt the Church which was at Jeruſalem*, Acts viii. 1. can it be ſuppoſed that the *Jewiſh Church*, perſecuted it's *own*

Mem-

Members!——And thus I might go on; but I chuſe to forbear; hoping that on due Conſideration, *Joſeph* may come to ſee his ERROR; and find that there was a *Chriſtian Church* properly ſo; not only before the Deſtruction of the *Temple*,—but alſo, before *Philip* baptized the *Eunuch*: And, that it's in vain, for him to endeavour to exclude *Water-Baptiſm* from the *Chriſtian Church*; by a *weak* Pretence, that there was no ſuch *Church*, while the *Jewiſh Temple* and *Worſhip* continued!

He ſtill goes on, p. 36. ſaying,—" To aſſert that " *Water-Baptiſm* is an Ordinance of Chriſt, is to aſcribe " to him at one and the ſame Time two *Baptiſms*, one " of the *Spirit*, and the other of *Water*, in Contradiction " to the expreſs Diſtinction of our Saviour himſelf re- " hearſed by *Peter*, and to the Teſtimony of the Apoſtle, " *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm*, Eph. iv. 5."——

In Anſwer to which, I ſay, That, I do venture, to *aſcribe* to our Lord, two *Baptiſms*, one of *Water*, and the other of the *Spirit*; and can't as yet ſee, any Abſurdity to follow; for I think two different Things, may be diſtinguiſhed one from the other, and yet both of them remain. And it's a very ſtrange Argument to me, that, becauſe two Things are not one, and are to be conſidered as diſtinct; that therefore, one is to be deemed *null* or *void*; or, that becauſe our *Lord*, and *Peter*, did not join *Water*, and *Spirit*, *Baptiſm*, ſo together; as to make thoſe *two one*; but kept up a Diſtinction, that therefore, *Water-Baptiſm* is ceaſed!

Farther, is the *aſcribing* to our Lord two continuing *Baptiſms*, a Contradiction, to our Lord's *expreſs Diſtinction?* when it's plain, that the *Text* only relates to the Difference, between the two *Baptiſms*; and does not give the leaſt Intimation, that one was to remain, and the other ceaſe. See *Acts* xi. 15, 16. *And as I began to ſpeak, the holy Ghoſt fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembred I the word of the Lord, how that he ſaid, John indeed baptized with water; but ye ſhall be baptized with the Holy Ghoſt.* I ſay, is the *aſcribing* to our

Lord two *Baptisms*, a Contradiction to this his expres's *Distinction?* if it be, let *Joseph* shew it. For will it follow, that becaufe our *Lord* has diftinguifhed between the two *Baptifms*; that therefore to afcribe two *Baptifms* to him is a Contradiction? Is, this Argument conclufive? does this, carry felf Evidence, or Conviction along with it? where is the Contradiction, in *afcribing* two *Baptifms* to our *Lord*; when, our *Lord* in diftinguifhing on them; excluded none? If indeed, our Lord in diftinguifhing them, had given Intimation, that *Water-Baptifm* was to be laid afide, when *Spirit-Baptifm* took Place; then, to have afcribed to our Lord thefe two, as continuing *Baptifms*; would have been a Contradiction. But fince our Lord has not given any fuch Intimation; nor yet the Apoftle, the *Contradiction*, is manifeftly, in *Joseph Beffe*.

Again, had *he* lived under the former Difpenfation, when there was an outward *Circumcifion* injoined; and an inward *Circumcifion* required; and had heard the *Prophets* diftinguifh, between the outward, and inward *Circumcifion*;—would he have inferred from thence, that the outward *Circumcifion* was ceafed? certainly no: And if he would not; how can *he* think, that it's a juft Inference, to conclude, from our *Lord*'s and the *Apoftle*'s *Diftinction*, between the two *Baptifms*; that therefore, one of them is to be laid afide?

Again, tho' the Prophets of old, did teach, that the inward *Circumcifion*,—was the main or principal Thing; —yet, they no where taught, nor encouraged the People to neglect the outward *Circumcifion*. Now, tho' it's allowed, that the *inward or fpiritual Baptifm*, be the Main or Principal; yet, neither our *Lord*, nor his *Apoftles*, never taught, nor encouraged any, to neglect, or omit the outward *Baptifm* of *Water*. And until *Joseph* can fhew, that our *Lord* or his *Apoftle*, by diftinguifhing between the two *Baptifms*, did exclude one; or that they taught Perfons to neglect—*Water-Baptifm*; *Water-Baptifm* will remain an initiating Ordinance, or Duty

under

under this Diſpenſation; as well as *Spirit Baptiſm*, according to God's good Pleaſure, a Priviledge.

But, in order to prove, that there is but ONE *Baptiſm* to continue, under this Diſpenſation, I obſerve, he produces the Words of the Apoſtle *Paul*, *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm.* Eph. iv. 5. From which Words I ſuppoſe, he concludes, that there is *but one Baptiſm*, now to continue; and that is *Spirit Baptiſm.* I might here indeed, go on to conſider, what Baptiſm it is that the Apoſtle does here intend; But as I acknowledge a *Spiritual Baptiſm*,—it's not ſo material.

The main Thing between us, is, whether there is now but *one Baptiſm* in all; and whether this Text proves it.

The *enlightened Dell*, in his *Doctrine of Baptiſms*, p. 37. is pleaſed to add the Word BUT, to the ſacred Text; in order to exclude all *Baptiſms*, ſave *Spiritual Baptiſm.* So likewiſe, *J. Pike*, p. 25. who with regard to this *Text* ſays, expreſly, "*there is* BUT ONE *Baptiſm.*"—And ſo ſays *R. Barclay*, p. 280. Now, ſuppoſe it were allowed, that this *Text* intends *Spirit Baptiſm*, ; and the Term BUT was annexed thereto; yet, then I can't ſee, that it would anſwer the *Quakers* Purpoſe; *i. e.* to *exclude* all other *Baptiſms.*

For, it would only then prove, that there is but *one Spirit Baptiſm:* which is not denied: and yet then, there would be two *Baptiſms*; beſide *Water-Baptiſm:* for the *Baptiſm* of *Sufferings*, will more or leſs, attend all that will *live Godly in Chriſt Jeſus*; which, is what I think the *Quakers* will not deny. But, I think, it's very unjuſtifiable, for theſe *Authors*, to pretend to add the *Term* BUT, to the ſacred *Text:* And it ſhews in them, a Deſire, of being *wiſe above what is written.*

And, as the *New Teſtament*, ſpeaks of ſeveral different *Baptiſms*; it's very ſtrange arguing to me, that when the *Apoſtle* is only concerned, to mention ONE of *them*; it ſhould from thence be inferred, that all other Baptiſms, are *null* and void!

(a) *Tho' I allow, that properly ſpeaking,* there is but one Baptiſm; *but then, that is Water-Baptiſm: For, if we have Regard to the* Etymology *of, or Meaning of the Word,* Baptize, *it doth, according to* R. Barclay, *as* p. 299. *ſignifie,* to plunge and dip in—Water. *Therefore, when the Word* Baptiſm,—*is uſed, or applied to any Thing elſe; it is to be underſtood, in a figurative Senſe; and the Baptiſm intended, but a* figurative, *or* metaphorical *one. The Conſequence of which, the* Quakers, *would do well to conſider of*

Again, I obſerve that the *Quakers* themſelves allow, that, there are ſeveral *Baptiſms*, even beſides that with *Water*; as *W. Pen*, v. 2. p. 904. his Words are, ſpeaking with regard to the *Commiſſion*; that,——" unleſs there " were no other Baptiſm than that of *Water*, AS " THERE ARE SEVERAL, it muſt at leaſt be al- " lowed to be a *Queſtion*, what *Baptiſm* Chriſt meant in " that *Commiſſion*."——Now from hence it's evident, that *W. Pen*, owns there are more *Baptiſms* than *one*; and therefore, if it ſhould be allowed, that *Eph.* iv. 5. be meant of *Spirit Baptiſm*; yet, that would no Way prove, that *Water-Baptiſm*, is ceaſed. Beſides, we find, that under the DIRECTION, of the Apoſtle St. *Paul*, the Diſciples at *Epheſus*, who, tho' they had been *baptized* according to *John*; yet,—they were again *baptized* in *Water*. And this laſt Baptiſm, was adminiſtred, *in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*. Acts. xix. 5. which *Text*, *R. Barclay*, in his *Apology*, p. 295. cites, among other *Texts*, as that which relates to *Water-Baptiſm*: which Paſſage of *Barclay*'s I ſhall hereafter, take more particular Notice of. But, from hence it's plain, that the Apoſtle *Paul*, who, as a *Steward of the Goſpel of Chriſt*; had a particular Regard to *Water-Baptiſm*; as was manifeſt, by his Care to inſtruct thoſe *Epheſians*; whoſe Underſtanding he found was ſomewhat ſhort, in that as well as in other Things; and therefore, he farther informed them; which, when he had ſo done, they were, according to *Barclay*, baptized again in *Water*; and that *in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*. And thus was the *Church* at *Epheſus*, ſettled in the *true* Order of the *Goſpel*; in the Point of *Water-Baptiſm*: as well, as in that of the *Baptiſm* of the *Spirit*. So that, from hence it's evident, that the Apoſtle owned two *Baptiſms*: and that with reſpect to both, he was very careful, to ſet the *Diſciples* at *Epheſus* right. And therefore, when the Apoſtles ſpeaks, *Eph.* iv. 5. of *one Baptiſm*, it can't be ſuppoſed, that he there excludes that of *Water*; nor yet, that he there teaches, there is BUT ONE *Baptiſm* which belongs to the

Goſ-

Gospel of Christ: since it's so manifest, that he did *exhibit* to them, the *Doctrine* of *Baptisms*, even, that of *Water*; and also, that of the *Holy Ghost*: Acts xix. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Which well agrees, with the Words of the Apostle, when he is concerned to speak, of *the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ*; mentions, that of *Baptisms*, in the plural, *Heb.* vi. 1, 2. of which, more in another Place.

And, for the *Quakers* to talk so much as they do, of, THE ONE BAPTISM, and of *Christ's own Baptism*; as tho' there was no other *Baptism*, than *Spirit Baptism*; shews but the *Height* of *Bigotism*, or *blind Zeal*; for a Notion; for which they have no just Grounds: Forasmuch, as there are no such *Sentences*, in all the *New Testament*; and from whence it's evident, and also from the *Quakers own Writings*, that, there are more *Baptisms* than *one!* From hence it appears, how *ridiculous*, and *inconsistent* it is, for the *Quakers*, to argue so very much, as they often do, in their *Writings*; that there is now, *but one Baptism.*

Joseph proceeds, saying, " The Apostle *Peter*'s com-
" manding those *Gentiles* to *be baptized* with Water, ap-
" pears to us of no more Force than his not only com-
" manding, but *compelling* the *Gentiles to live as do the*
" *Jews.* Gal. ii. 14."

But in Answer to this, I observe, that when the Apostle *Paul*, saw or knew that his Brother *Peter*, derogated, or *walked not according to the Truth of the Gospel*;—he gave *Peter* a kind *of Reprimand*; *saying*,—*why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?* But we do not find, that *Paul* ever *blamed Peter* for commanding any to be *baptized in Water.* It's therefore, at least, a strong Presumption; that he approved of what *Peter* had done on that Account: and that it was according to the *Truth of the Gospel.* And if with this, we consider the Care *Paul* took, with the *Disciples* at *Ephesus*, to set them right in this Point; and never blamed any for preaching, and practising *Water-Baptism*; but on the con-

contrary, did *ſo baptize* ſome himſelf; it's manifeſt, he concluded that that Baptiſm, was according to the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*.

Joſeph, yet goes on, ſaying,—" This Manner of " urging the Practice of the Apoſtles, who were *Jews*, " as a Proof that WHATEVER they did was an Or- " dinance of Chriſt, and obliging to all *Chriſtians*, has a " Tendency to re-eſtabliſh the *Ceremonies* of the *Mo-* " *ſaick Law*."——

Now, with reſpect to this, if any have ſo done; I am ſomewhat of his Mind:——But, can he find, that I, ever ſo argued; or indeed, any one elſe? Is not this a *ſophiſtical Suggeſtion*; thus to *inſinuate?* as tho' I had argued, that WHATEVER the Apoſtles did, *was an Ordinance of Chriſt*; *and obliging to all Chriſtians!* If, I have any where ſo done, let him produce it: but if not; what good End could he have ſo to inſert it? If, he can't maintain his Argument, without ſuch *Fallacy*; it would be much more honourable for him to confeſs it; and acknowledge to the *Truth*.

Beſides, it's manifeſt that the Apoſtle circumciſed *Timothy*, and did ſome other Things, *purely* out of Condeſcention to the *Jews*, as *Acts* xvi. 3. and xxi. 21, 22, 23.—the firſt of which, *Joſeph Beſſe* expreſly owns, p. 281. to the *Vicar*, was done *in Condeſcention*.——And agreeable to this, are the Words of the *Text* relating to *Paul*'s circumciſing *Timothy*, Acts xvi. 3. *Him would Paul have to go forth with him, and took, and circumciſed him, becauſe of the Jews which were in thoſe quarters*.——Now, can *Joſeph* ſhew one *Text*, wherein it will appear, that the Apoſtles practiſed *Water-Baptiſm*, in Condeſcention to the *Jews*; as is the above concerning *Circumciſion?* which if he cannot do; how trifling is it, for him to ſay, as he does to the *Vicar*, p. 281. " WHY MIGHT " NOT they (i. e. *the Apoſtles)* alſo *baptize* with *Water* " on the ſame Conſideration."——

In Anſwer to which, I ſay, that they could not, (properly ſpeaking) ſo do; becauſe, as *Water-Baptiſm*

Was

was contained in the *Doctrine* they *preached*; it could not be a Point of *Condescention*, in them to practice it. And here, I can't but take Notice also, of his WHY MIGHT NOT; as well as his MAY DENOTE; which I observed before. But am at a Loss to know, what such Expressions prove; unless they prove his Want of real Argument. For it's meer trifling to argue, that because the Apostle circumcised,—that therefore, there is the same Argument for the Practice of *Circumcision*; as there is for *Water-Baptism:* when it's manifest, that the Apostle declares against the Practice of *Circumcision*, Gal. v. 3. and that when he circumcised *Timothy*, it was *purely out of Condescention* to the *Jews*, Acts xvi. 3. But with respect to *Water-Baptism*, it's plain, that both *Paul*, and *Peter*, preached it; as well as practised it. *Acts* ii. 38. Chap. xviii. 8. And in particular, *Paul* was careful to set such right, in the Knowledge, and Practice, of *Water-Baptism*, as were ignorant of the *true Doctrine* concerning it. *Acts* xix. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. And the Apostle also *ranks in Water-Baptism*, as one of the *Principles of the Doctrine of Christ*. Heb. vi. 1, 2. But it's not so, with respect to *Circumcision*.——

And farther, with regard to the Practice of *Water-Baptism*; it's no where said that it was done *because of the Jews*. But it was that which was contained in the Doctrine, the *Apostles preached*; as well as practised: and *Faith in Christ*, was a *necessary Qualification* to fit Men for it. All which considered together, makes it plain, that tho' *Paul circumcised Timothy*;—yet, that affords no Argument for the Continuance thereof. When, as above, it's evident, that there is Argument sufficient, to shew, that *Water-Baptism*, was to be continued in the Gospel Church:—it being one of the *foundation Principles of the Doctrine of Christ*.

But, how comes it to pass, that *Joseph* does not here take any particular Notice, of what I offer'd from *Acts* x. 47, 48. as contained, in the 23d and 24th Pages of mine, on *Water-Baptism*; as well as he has of the other

Paſſages I inſiſted on? did it not ſuit, the Purpoſe of his Argument ſo to do? or, does he think it not worthy of an Anſwer? However, be that as it will, I ſhall give it a Place here. Where ſpeaking of the Apoſtle *Peter*, I ſay,—" We have an Account of his preaching the " *Goſpel* to the *Gentiles*; and that *while he ſpake, the Holy* " *Ghoſt fell on all them which heard the Word*; *ſo that they* " *ſpake with Tongues, and magnified God.* Whereupon " *Peter* ſaid, *Can any Man forbid Water, that theſe ſhould* " *not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghoſt as well* " *as we?* (*a*) Which is as tho' the Apoſtle had ſaid, " foraſmuch as God hath given theſe, who are *Gentiles*, " the *like Gifts as he did unto us, who believed in the Lord*; " it's evident, that the Bleſſings of the Goſpel is not " confined to the Houſe of *Iſrael*; but deſigned of God " *to all Nations.* And ſince he hath thus diſcovered his " Approbation of them; there is no Occaſion to exa- " mine them in particular concerning their Faith; nor " Doubt to be made of their being qualified for Ad- " mittance into the Goſpel Church, by the *initial* Or- " dinance of Baptiſm: and therefore, *can any Man for-* " *bid Water, that theſe ſhould not be baptized, which have* " *received the Holy Ghoſt as well as we?* No, certainly, " none; therefore we find he *commanded them to be bap-* " *tized in the Name of the Lord.* And let it be obſerved, " That here is not the leaſt Appearance, that theſe " *Gentile* Converts, were baptized with Water, out of " any Condeſcention to the Humours or Weakneſs of " any: and alſo, That there is a vaſt Difference be- " tween a bare Complying or Condeſcention, and a " COMMANDING Perſons, to be baptized *in the* " *Name of the Lord.* And, ſurely, none can well con- " clude, that the Apoſtle, who was under the imme- " diate Inſpiration of the Spirit; would do, or have " any Thing done, *in the Name of the Lord*, in that " ſolemn Manner, which did not belong to his Doc- " trine.

(*a*) Acts x. 47, 48.

" trine. From all which it doth abundantly appear,
" That Water-Baptiſm is an Ordinance of Chriſt. And
" how can any think themſelves above it; when the
" inſpired Apoſtle, commanded ſuch who had received
" the miraculous Gifts, to ſubmit themſelves to it?
" And now, Sirs, judge which is ſafeſt; whether to
" receive St. *Peter*'s Doctrine, while under the peculiar
" Government of the Spirit; or thoſe who pretend to
" a *Light within*, and oppoſe this Doctrine and Practice.
" Not that I would be underſtood, to judge or cenſure
" any for acting according to the Dictates of their own
" Minds; tho' I fear too many do not apply, and
" attend ſo impartially to the Means of Grace as they
" ought to do"

Now, with reſpect to what I have above obſerved; I find no direct Anſwer: but if I go back 13 Pages of his, I find there he has ſaid ſomething to the *Text*; and therefore, I will here take Notice of it. He there ſpeaking with regard, to the *Gift of the Holy Ghoſt on Cornelus and his Company*, ſays, " This clearly denotes
" that the Baptiſm of the *Holy Ghoſt* was that which ac-
" companied the Preaching of *Peter*, and not *Water-*
" *Baptiſm.*"——

Now, tho' the *Gift* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, did, accompany *Peter*'s Preaching; yet, his Preaching did NOT GIVE, the *Holy Ghoſt*. Tho' I conclude, it was a Means to prepare them, for the *Reception* of it. But, it's one Thing to prepare, or qualify to receive a *Gift*, and another, to beſtow it. And it's very plain, when *Peter* comes to rehearſe the Matter, as chap. xi. he does not in the leaſt, attribute it to the *Power of his Preaching*; but intirely to the *Gift of God*, as ver. 17. where ſays he, *Foraſmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jeſus Chriſt; what was I that I could withſtand God?* From which Words of the Apoſtle, with the foregoing, it's plain, that he had not any ſuch *Notion*, as the *Quakers* have, of *baptizing by Preaching*. For when he ſays,—*What*

was I that I could withſtand God? it's evident, that it was Part of the *Defence* which he made, againſt thoſe which *contended* with *him*, in regard to his Conduct; the whole Event of which, he *aſcribes* to God. I ſay, it's manifeſt, that *Peter* did not know any Thing of *baptizing by Preaching:* For if he had expected or known any Thing of *baptizing* with the *Holy Ghoſt*, by *preaching* the *Goſpel*, how could he ſay in his own Defence,—*What was I that I could withſtand God?*

But *Joſeph* goes on, ſignifying, that the adminiſtering *Water-Baptiſm* to *Cornelus*, and them with him, was *but a prudential Circumſtance*, in order to admit them into the *Jewiſh* Church.

Now as I have ſufficiently ſpoken to the Subſtance of this; when I took Notice of the *Eunuch*'s Baptiſm, I think it's but to little Purpoſe to repeat it again: for, I conclude, it will from thence plainly appear, that Perſons by receiving *Water-Baptiſm* as practiſed by the Apoſtles, did not become *Members* of the *Jewiſh*, but of the *Chriſtian Church.*

The next Paſſage I inſiſted on, was, *Acts* xix. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.—from which I obſerved, p. 24, 25.—" That the " Apoſtle *Paul* found at *Epheſus* ſome of *John*'s Diſciples, " *who had not ſo much as* HEARD *whether there was any* " HOLY GHOST, (*a*) they being ſuch as had only " been baptized according to *John's Baptiſm*, that is, *in* " *the Belief of a Chriſt to come*; when it's plain, the Diſ- " ciples of Jeſus believed in Chriſt as already come, and " were *baptized* into that *Faith*; which, when the Apoſtle " had ſet theſe right in the Knowledge of, they were " then *baptized in the Name of the Lord Jeſus.* (*b*) After " which we read, that when the Apoſtle had *laid his* " *Hands on them, the Holy Ghoſt came on them*; *and they* " *ſpake with Tongues and propheſied*; which ſtill proves " that *Water-Baptiſm* is a Goſpel Ordinance: Foraſ- " much as theſe were then *baptized in the Name of the* " *Lord*

(*a*) Acts xix. 2. (*b*) Acts xix, 5.

" *Lord Jesus*, who before was baptized according to " *John's Baptism*; and yet was not baptized with the " Holy Ghost, 'till after they had been baptized *in the* " *Name of the Lord:* which baptizing *in the Name of the* " *Lord*, always signifies, that the baptized Person was " *baptized* in the *Faith* of Christ already come; which " *John's Disciples* was not. And herein *John's*, and " *Christ's*, Baptism with Water differ, even in Point of " Qualification; as well as in it's being administred *in* " *the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy* " *Ghost:* (*a*) *or in the* Name of the Lord Jesus: (*b*) " which latter I take to be only a shorter Way of " speaking. (*c*)

In Answer to which *Joseph* says, p. 37, 38. " He yet " produces another *Text*, viz. *Acts* xix. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 6. " which relates, *that* Paul *came to* Ephesus, *and finding* " *certain Disciples, he said unto them, Have ye received the* " *Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him,* " *We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy* " *Ghost. And he said unto them, unto what then were ye* " *baptized? And they said, Unto* John's *Baptism. Then* " *said* Paul, John *verily baptized with the Baptism of Re-* " *pentance, saying unto the People, that they should believe* " *on him which should come after him, that is on Christ Je-* " *sus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the Name* " *of the Lord Jesus. And when* Paul *had laid his Hands up-* " *on them, the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake* " *with Tongues and prophesied.* This Text which plainly " shews the Invalidity of *Water-Baptism*, and in what a " State of Ignorance Men may be notwithstanding their " having submitted to that Ceremony, is by him pro- " duced to prove, that the Apostle *Paul* did again bap- " tize those Persons with Water; altho' the Text does " not say so, nor indeed is it probable that the Apostle " should rebaptize them with the Baptism of Water,

" which

(*a*) Mat. xxviii. 19. (*b*) Acts viii. 16. (*c*) Agreeable to Acts ii. 38. and viii. 16.

" which they had already experienced to be so ineffec-
" tual. These Words, *they were baptized in the Name of*
" *the Lord Jesus*, seem in this Place to denote the *Baptism*
" *of the Holy Ghost*, and to be so explained by the next
" Words, viz. *And when* Paul *had laid his Hands upon*
" *them, the Holy Ghost came on them.* So that this Text
" which he produces to prove *Water-Baptism a Gospel*
" *Ordinance*, is so far from answering his Purpose, that
" it doth not prove the Apostle's administring to those
" Persons any Water-Baptism at all. Wherefore this
" Author acts most *preposterously* in pretending, p. 25.
" to shew wherein " *John*'s and CHRIST's Baptism
" with Water differed." while yet he hath not made
" appear that CHRIST did ever *baptize* with Water, or
" commission his Disciples so to do. And altho' it ap-
" pears and may be granted him, that *Paul* in some
" few Instances did administer *Water-Baptism*, yet we
" have his own express Testimony that *Christ sent him*
" *not* on that Errand. 1 *Cor.* i. 17."

But, whether *Joseph*, by his *Examination*, has render'd my Argument invalid;—I leave to the Judgment of my Reader. And as it's my Turn now to *examine* his, I shall take the Liberty, to be somewhat large.——

And *First*, I observe he says, " This Text—plainly
" shews the Invalidity of *Water-Baptism*, and in what a
" State of Ignorance Men may be notwithstanding their
" having submitted to that Ceremony."—In answer to which I say, that as to this, I am somewhat of his Mind, *viz.* that those which knew *only* the Baptism of *John*, might be in *a State of Ignorance*, tho' they submitted thereto; since, such were baptized in the *Faith of a Christ to come*; (as is plain from the Text) and not in the *Faith of Christ as already come*; or, not *in the Name of the Lord Jesus*.

Secondly, I observe, that he says, " These Words,
" *they were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus*, seem in
" this Place to denote the *Baptism* of the *Holy Ghost*."
" —And so likewise, he tells us, p. 25.—" that the

" *Bap-*

" *Baptiſm in the Name of the Lord Jeſus* here ſpoken of, " was that of the *Holy Ghoſt*."——

Now, the *Baptiſm* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, I think *all the Quakers*, would fain have be, that Baptiſm intended by our Lord in the *Commiſſion*. Which if ſo, then it will follow, that Perſons being baptized *in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*, were *baptized* according to *Chriſt*'s *Commiſſion*. And therefore, 'tis to no Purpoſe for *Joſeph Beſſe*, nor his *Friends*, ever to argue more, that the Paſſages recorded of Perſons being *baptized in the Name of the Lord*; or, *in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*; or, *in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt*; as mentioned in the *Acts*; were not *baptized* according to *Chriſt*'s *Commiſſion*: and *Joſeph Pike* alſo owns, that theſe different Expreſſions of *Baptizing*, ſignify the ſame; or, as he phraſes it, " *which* " *is the ſame*," p. 47. So likewiſe it's evident, that as my Antagoniſt, would have the *Baptiſm* mentioned *Acts* xix 5.—to be the *Baptiſm* of the *Holy Ghoſt*; and as the *Quakers* all pretend, that to be the *Baptiſm*, intended in the *Commiſſion*; it's manifeſt, even from *Joſeph*'s and his *Friend*'s Words, that the Apoſtles in adminiſtering *Baptiſm, in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*, adminiſter'd that *Baptiſm*, contained, in our *Lord's Commiſſion*. Mat. xxviii. 19. And therefore, how *trifling*, and inconſiſtent is it, for the *Quakers*, at other Times, to pretend; that, when Perſons are exhorted to, or, are ſaid to be *baptized in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*;—that the *Baptiſm* intended, was NOT, according to *Chriſt's Commiſſion*; when, it ſo evidently appears, from my Opponent's, and his *Friend*'s Words. ——

And, from hence it's alſo manifeſt, agreeable as I obſerved from this *Text*, that *baptizing in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*; is only a *ſhorter* Way of ſpeaking; or, is put for,—*baptizing in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*. Mat. xxviii. 19. And agreeable hereto ſays *Tho. Lancaſter*, in his *True Spiritual Baptiſm*, &c. p. 37. " *though it is true that we do not find* " *them* (that is the Apoſtles) *baptizing in the*—*ex-*

" *preſs*

" *preſs* NAME *of the Holy-Ghoſt*; *yet*, WE *preſume, that* " *doth not argue there was no ſuch Thing.*" Now, ſince our NOT finding, that the Apoſtles baptized in the expreſs Words of the *Commiſſion*; doth *not argue* but what they did ſo baptize; and ſince according to *Joſeph Beſſe*, —*baptizing in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*,—was *baptizing* according to *Chriſt's Commiſſion*: it follows, that the *Baptiſm* which the *inſpired* Apoſtles, adminiſtred, as mentioned in the *Acts*, was the *Baptiſm*, intended in the *Comminition of our Lord.*

Now, if I can make it appear, that the *Baptiſm* which the Apoſtles exhorted to, and adminiſter'd, *in the Name of the Lord*,—was that of *Water*; it then, will be manifeſt, according to the above,—that, it's *Water-Baptiſm* intended in *Chriſt's Commiſſion*. And this, I doubt not but to do, and that by the *New Teſtament*; and from the formentioned *Authors*. See firſt, *Tho. Ellwood*'s Sacred *Hiſtory*, p. 503. where ſpeaking with reſpect to the Apoſtle's Words, *Acts* ii. 38. *Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt*,—he ſays,—" *That the* " *Baptiſm here mentioned, was the Baptiſm of John.*"—— Now, by this it's plain, he means *Water-Baptiſm.*—And *Joſeph Pike*, p. 107. as before cited, is very expreſs and clear, that this *Baptiſm* is the *Baptiſm* of *Water*. Now, from theſe *Quakers*, it's evident, that the *Baptiſm* mentioned in this *Text*, is NOT the *Baptiſm* of the *Holy Ghoſt*; but that of *Water*. And indeed, this is moſt evident from the *Text*; where, the Apoſtle makes a manifeſt *Diſtinction*, between the *Baptiſm in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt*, and *the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt*. So that from hence, according to the aforementioned *Authors*, as conſidered together, it's plain; not only, that the *Baptiſm* mentioned *Acts* ii. 38. is *Water-Baptiſm*; but alſo, that it's *Water-Baptiſm*, intended in *Chriſt's Commiſſion.*

Secondly, it's plain from *Acts* viii. 14, 15. that the *Baptiſm* which the *Samaritans* were *baptized* with, *in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*, was *Water-Baptiſm:* For ſaith the *Text*, with regard to the *Gift* of the *Holy Ghoſt*;—*as*

yet

yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus. From whence it's most evident, that the *Baptism* which the *Samaritans* were *baptized* with, was that of *Water.* And, as it was *in the Name of the Lord Jesus*; it was, according to what I have before observed;—*the Baptism* given in *Commission*, by our *Lord*; Mat. xxviii. 19. And this will appear, yet more clear; if we consider, that the Words IN *the Name*,—in this *Text*, is in the *Greek*, INTO *the Name*; as well as in our Lord's *Commission:* which shews the Agreeableness, of the two *Texts*; and also, that to *baptize into the Name*,—*with Water*, is to *baptize* by the Authority, and into the *Faith*,—of *God the Father*, *and of the Son*, *and of the Holy Ghost.* And, tho' it's not so *expressed*; yet, according to *Tho. Lancaster*, it *does not argue*, but that so it was.——

Thirdly, the same may be argued from *Peter*'s, commanding *Cornelius*, and his Company, to be *baptized* in *Water*; Acts x. 47, 48. forasmuch, as *he commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord.* Which, as I observed before; *Pike* owns *is the same*, as to be baptized, *in the Name of the Lord Jesus*; as in *Acts* xix. 5. which *Joseph Besse*, as before observed, explains to be the same *Baptism*, as he concludes, is to be understood in the *Commission:* So, that it's but a just *Inference*, to *infer*, that forasmuch as he declares, that the *Baptism in the Name of the Lord Jesus*, Acts xix. 5. is the *Baptism*; which *Joseph* and his *Friends*, would *fain* have be the *Baptism* intended in *Christ's Commission.* I say, it's but a a just, or *natural Inference* from his Words, that the *Baptism in the Name of the Lord Jesus*, Acts xix. 5. is the same, according to him, as in the *Commission of Christ.* Which Baptism, *Acts* xix. 5. according to *Barclay*, is, to be understood *Water-Baptism*; and therefore, from these *Authors* Concessions; it's evident, that it's *Water-Baptism* intended in our Lord's *Commission*, Mat. xxviii. 19. So that I think, I may very justly here say, as in the

Preface; *that the very Oppoſers of God's Cauſe, and Truth, are found to do that, which, inſtead of being againſt it, is, what does* abundantly *tend to diſcover and confirm it!*——

And *fourthly*, that *Water-Baptiſm* is intended *Acts* xix. 5. when the Diſciples at *Epheſus* were ſaid to be *baptized in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*, is clear; becauſe it is *diſtinguiſhed* from the *Baptiſm*, or *Gift* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, in the very Paſſage itſelf; which runs thus, ver. 5, 6. *When they heard this, they were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jeſus.*

And when Paul had laid his Hands upon them, the Holy Ghoſt came on them, and they ſpake with Tongues, and propheſied.

And, of the ſame Mind was that great and learned *Quaker*, *R. Barclay*; as appears in his Apology, p. 295. where he is taking Notice of the Paſſages in the *Acts*, which relate to the Adminiſtration of *Water-Baptiſm*; cites as follows: *Acts* ii. 41.—viii. 12, 13, 38.—ix. 18. —x. 48.—xvi. 15.—xviii. 8.—viii. 16. and laſtly *Acts* xix. 5.

Now, here I obſerve, that all thoſe *Texts* in the *Acts*, which I have argued, intend *Water-Baptiſm*; are ALL of them allow'd ſo to do; by *this Author*. And not only ſo, but alſo, that *Paul* by *Ananias* was ſo *baptized*: which *Joſeph Beſſe*, would do well to think of; and compare, with his Anſwer to the *Vicar*, p. 287.——And farther, here I find that *Barclay* allows *Acts* xviii. 8. to intend *Water-Baptiſm*; where we have an Account of the Succeſs of St. *Paul*'s Miniſtry at *Corinth*; and are told, that,—*many of the Corinthians* HEARING, *believed, and were baptized.* But to return; it's evident from the above Citation, that *Robert Barclay* applies *Acts* xix. 5. to *Water-Baptiſm*; which, when conſider'd with the *ſacred Text*; one would think, might be enough to convince *Joſeph Beſſe*; that *Paul* either did baptize, or, that he had the *Diſciples* at *Epheſus*, *baptized*, again with *Water*. And therefore it's plain, that, as they had before, according to *John*, been baptized in the *Belief* of

Chriſt

Chriſt to come; ſo then by *Paul*, or at *leaſt* by his Direction, they were again *baptized*, with *Water*; *in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*; or in the *Faith* of *Chriſt*; as then already come. So that here is a manifeſt Difference, between *John*'s, and *Chriſt*'s *Baptiſm* with *Water*; even in *Point of Qualification*; as well as in its being adminiſtred, *in the Name of the Lord Jeſus.*——

And, it is manifeſt, that *Joſeph Beſſe*, doth oppoſe, or contradict, his *Friend*, *Barclay*, with reſpect to the Senſe of *Acts* xix. 5. for it's plain, that *Barclay*, would have this *Text* underſtood of *Water-Baptiſm:* but *Joſeph*, in his *Exam.* p. 25, 38. will have it be the *Baptiſm* of the *Holy Ghoſt*. Now, how unaccountable is it, that the *Quakers*, who pretend that the *Light*, in them; is a *Meaſure* of that *Spirit* by which the *Scriptures* were given forth: when they ſo *palpably*, or plainly *contradict each other*; even, in theſe Things; which, undoubtedly, they had thought deliberately upon! But, as *R. Barclay*, (I ſuppoſe) will be allow'd, to be one of the *moſt eminent* among the *Quakers*; ſo alſo, his *Apology* by them, the moſt compleateſt *Syſtem* of *Divinity*; as is evident from an *Advertiſement*, inſerted at the End of *Ben. Martin*'s *Philological Library*, done by the Deſire or Direction of the *Quakers*. And therefore, ought not *Joſeph Beſſe* to ſubmit to the Judgment, of his *learned* and *judicious Friend*, *R. Barclay*; and according to him *receive* for *Truth*, that the Diſciples at *Epheſus* were again *baptized* in *Water:* and that this laſt *Baptiſm*; was *in the Name of the Lord Jeſus:* Which *Baptiſm*, ſays *Tho. Ellwood*, in his *Sacred Hiſtory*, p. 614. was, INTO *the Name of the Lord Jeſus.*——Now, as this *Text*, Acts xix. 5. according to *Barclay*, relates to the *baptizing* the *Epheſians* with *Water*; and that by the Apoſtle *Paul*, or as aforeſaid, by his Direction:—And, as this *Baptiſm* according to *Ellwood*, was, INTO *the Name of the Lord Jeſus*; it ſheweth, not only the Agreeableneſs thereof to the *Commiſſion of Chriſt*, Mat. xxviii. 19. but from hence, it's alſo very evident, that St. *Paul* underſtood that *Com-*

miſſion, to intend *Water-Baptiſm:* and that he accordingly, as above, ſo *baptized* them. And therefore, who has acted moſt *prepoſterouſly* (as he phraſes it, *viz.* diſorderly) in this Caſe; I leave to the Conſideration of the Reader.

He goes on, and concludes his Paragraph, ſaying, "Altho' it appears and may be granted——that *Paul* "in ſome few Inſtances did adminiſter *Water-Baptiſm*, "yet we have his own expreſs Teſtimony that *Chriſt* "*ſent him not on that Errand.* 1 Cor. i. 17."

Anſwer. I ſuppoſe by theſe Words, *Joſeph Beſſe* would have it be received for *Truth*, that *Paul* had no *Commiſſion* to *baptize* with *Water:* and alſo, that thoſe which he did ſo *baptize*; were *baptized* in Condeſcention to the *Jews*; as he would fain inſinuate to the *Vicar*, p. 281. Now, that *Paul*'s *baptizing* with *Water*, was not a Point of *Condeſcention*;—but that he therein, acted by *divine Authority*, or *Commiſſion*, I truſt will appear, in the following Lines.

And firſt, I think, it's an allow'd *Principle*, that all ſuch *Texts* of *Scripture*, as ſeem to claſh with other Paſſages, ought to be conſidered with them of like Import; and alſo with ſuch *Texts*, which they at leaſt ſeem to oppoſe.——But, before I proceed, I think proper to inſert the *Text* under Debate; 1 *Cor.* i. 17. where ſays the Apoſtle, *For Chriſt ſent me not to baptize, but to preach the Goſpel.*——Which Words of the Apoſtle, I conceive are ſpoken in a *comparative* Senſe, as thus, *That Chriſt ſent him* NOT chiefly *to baptize, but* principally *to preach the Goſpel.*——Now of the like Import to this, are the Words of our Lord, *John* xii. 44. —*He that believeth on me, believeth* NOT *on me*, BUT *on him that ſent me.*

Which is as tho' *Chriſt* had ſaid, *He that believeth on me, believeth not* only *on me, but* alſo *on him that ſent me.* Again, *John* vi. 27. *Labour* NOT *for the Meat that periſheth,* BUT *for that which endureth to eternal Life.* Which Words of our Lord, I think the *Quakers* will allow,

allow, are to be underſtood *comparatively*, viz. *Labour not* chiefly, *for the Meat that periſheth, but* principally *for that which endureth to eternal Life.*

Now, from hence it's plain, that in ſuch *Texts* as theſe,—the *Term* NOT, is to be underſtood, as a *Term* of *Diſtinction*; and not of *Excluſion.* For, if we were to underſtand it here, as a Term of *Excluſion*; then it would not be a Duty for the *Diſciples* of *Chriſt*, to *labour* for their daily Food.——But then, this would be contrary to the Doctrine of the Apoſtle *Paul*, who ſays,—*This we command you, that if any would not work neither ſhould he eat.*——So in like Manner, I think it's plain, in theſe Words of the Apoſtle; that the Word, NOT, is only as a *comparative Term of Diſtinction*, and not of *Excluſion.* And as ſuch, the Text does only teach, that it was *Paul*'s *main* or *chief* Buſineſs, as an APOSTLE; *to preach the Goſpel*, for which, he was in an *extraordinary* Manner qualified of God. So that he could ſay, —*in nothing am I behind the very chiefeſt of the Apoſtles.*— 2 Cor. xii. 11.

Now, from the above Paſſages, and from many more that might be cited, it's plain, that the Term NOT, is often to be underſtood by Way of *Diſtinction.* And, that it's a *Term* of *Diſtinction*, in 1 *Cor.* i. 17. and not of *Excluſion*; will appear, from the Conſideration of ſeveral Paſſages of the New Teſtament; with which the latter Sence, would claſh with or oppoſe.

And *firſt*, I ſhall take Notice of ſome Part of the Account, we have of the Converſion of *Saul*; who afterwards was called the Apoſtle *Paul*; to whom *Ananias*, a Diſciple, and Servant of God, was ſent; ſaying,—— *Brother Saul, the Lord (even Jeſus that appeared unto thee in the way as thou cameſt) hath ſent me, that thou mighteſt receive thy ſight, and be filled with the Holy Ghoſt.—The God of our fathers hath choſen thee, that thou ſhouldeſt know his will, and ſee that juſt One, and ſhouldeſt hear the voice of his mouth. For thou ſhalt be his witneſs unto all men, of what thou haſt ſeen and heard. And now why tarrieſt thou? ariſe,*

and

and be baptized, and waſh away thy ſins, calling on the name of the Lord. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been ſcales; and he received ſight forthwith, and aroſe, and was baptized. Acts ix. 17, 18. and chap. xxii. 14, 15, 16.

Now, from hence I obſerve, *firſt*, that *Ananias*, was ſent, to *Saul* with a Meſſage from our Lord: For ſays he,—*Jeſus that appeared unto thee in the way as thou comeſt hath ſent me.*—*Secondly*, that *Saul* was to be taught the Will of God;—by *Ananias*, as appears, from theſe Verſes, compared with Chap. ix. 6.—and xxii. 10.——*Thirdly*, that, one Part of the Meſſage of the *Lord*, by *Ananias*, to *Saul*, was, to let him know, that he ſhould bear his *Name before the Gentiles, and Kings, and the Children of Iſrael:* And alſo, that he ſhould *be a Witneſs unto all Men.*——*Fourthly*, that another Part of the Meſſage was, *And now, why tarrieſt thou? ariſe, and be baptized, and waſh away thy ſins, calling on the Name of the Lord.* ——*Fifthly*, I obſerve, that in Obedience to the *divine Will*, *Saul* aroſe, *and was baptized*; which *Baptiſm* is plain from the *Texts*, to be the *Baptiſm* of *Water:* elſe, for what Reaſon, ſhould *Ananias* ſay, *And now, why tarrieſt thou? ariſe, and be baptized.*——And agreeable thereto, we are told, that he *aroſe and was baptized.* And accordingly, *R. Barclay* ranks in this *Text* Acts ix. 18. among others, which he concludes relates to *Water-Baptiſm*; as is before cited: and as may be ſeen in his Apology, p. 295. So likewiſe *J. Pike*, p. 90. where ſpeaking of *Water-Baptiſm*, ſays, " ——*Ananias* adviſed *Paul* to be baptized therewith.——*Sixthly*, I obſerve from the Whole; that when *Paul* was thus called of God, to embrace *Chriſtianity*; he was among other Things in a particular Manner, not only put in Mind of *Water-Baptiſm*, but as it were, *rouſed* up by *Ananias* to the Practice of it; which plainly ſhews, that it was not an indifferent Thing, but, a Matter of Concern and Duty; as he was become a *Believer in Chriſt.*

Now,

Now, after all this, can any reasonable Person conclude, that the Apostle would *disclaim (as J. Besse phrases it)* the Practice of *Water-Baptism:* or, that any can once suppose, that the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* i. 17. is to be understood, to declare, that he had no Concern or Business, to *baptize with Water!* when it was that, which he was not only recommended to, but even urged, by *Ananias*, a special *Messenger* of God; to the Practice of. And, can it be thought, that *Paul*, as a *Minister* in propagating the *Gospel*, had another, or different, Doctrine to *preach*, relating to *Baptism*, than, what *Ananias*, had exhibited, and *pressed* upon him, on his embracing *Christianity?* which, when it's consider'd, I think, it's most reasonable to conclude, that the *Term* NOT, 1 *Cor.* i. 17. is only to be understood, as a *Term* of *Distinction*, as before; and not of *Exclusion*. Again, when it's consider'd, as is before observed, what Care, the Apostle, as a *Steward* of the Gospel, took, with the *Disciples* at *Ephesus*, to instruct, and set the *Ephesians* right, in the Ordinance of *Water-Baptism*; can it be once imagined, that he afterward relinquished, what he had been so earnestly stirr'd up to; and had shewn, such Care and *Zeal* for? No, the Apostle was not, such an unsteady *Person:* but was one *set for the Defence of the Gospel* of Christ; whose *Ways*, he *taught every where in every Church*, 1 Cor. iv. 17. And therefore for the *Quakers* to suppose, that the Apostle *dropt Water-Baptism*, or *laid it aside*, is not only, very inconsistent with his Conduct, —but is a very great *Reflection* on his Character; as a *Servant*, and *Steward of Christ*. And, as *Joseph Besse*, does in effect own, that the *Baptism* intended in *Acts* xix. 5. was the same, as he concludes is in the *Commission*; and as *Acts* xix. 5. relates to *Water-Baptism*, as is before observed; and since we find, that the Apostle concerned himself therein; we may justly conclude, he had a Trust that Way; and in the *faithful* Discharge thereof, acted by Vertue of, or according to, his *Lord's Commission*. So that, groundless is the *Notion* of the *Quakers*, who ima-

imagine, that the Apoſtle in this POINT, practiſed *Water-Baptiſm*, only in *Condeſcention*; and that he had no *Commiſſion*, or Charge that Way.

And farther, when the Apoſtle ſaid,—*Chriſt ſent him not to baptize*,—1 Cor. i. 17. it's not to be underſtood, as tho' he had no Concern or *Commiſſion* ſo to do. And this, I truſt will farther appear, on the Conſideration of ſome of the foregoing Verſes; where the Apoſtle takes Notice, of the unhappy *Contentions* that were among the *Corinthians*,—as ver. 11, 12. and ſays he ver. 13, 14, 15. *Is Chriſt divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul? I thank God, that I baptized none of you, but Criſpus and Gaius: Leſt any ſhould ſay, that I had baptized in mine own name.* Now, in the 13th Verſe it's plain, that the Apoſtle by way of Appeal, mixed with a kind of *Reproof*, interrogates with the *Corinthian Chriſtians*, on the Unreaſonableneſs of their *Diviſions*; in that they divided into Parties or Sects,—ſaying, *Is Chriſt divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?* As tho' the Apoſtle had ſaid, *how ſtrange is it, that you ſhould thus go into--- Parties; does Chriſt's Religion contain different, and contrary Doctrines, that you thus divide? is not his Religion one? was Paul or any of your Miniſters crucified for you? that there is ſuch crying up one above another? or was any of you baptized in the Name of Paul? was, ye not all baptized in the Name of Chriſt? how is it then; that you thus run into ſuch Diviſions?*——And this, is very plain to be the Senſe of St. *Paul*. And with reſpect to *Baptiſm*, his Argument to *Unity*, on that Account, conſiſts; in that they were not *baptized in the Name* of any of their *Miniſters*, but all of them *in the Name of Chriſt*.——Which *Baptiſm*, I think is allowed by all the *Quakers*,---to be *Water-Baptiſm*. And as the Apoſtle declares, that he *baptized* ſome of theſe *Corinthians*, it's but reaſonable from his own Words to conclude, that he *baptized* them *in the Name of Chriſt*. Agreeable, as were the *Epheſians* while under his Direction and Care, *Acts* xix. 5. *baptized in the Name*

of

of the Lord Jesus: Which Baptism *R. Barclay* owns to be *Water-Baptism*; and *Joseph Besse* does in effect declare, as hath been before observed, that the Baptism mentioned *Acts* xix. 5. is the same as in the *Commission*; it therefore is evident, not only as it appears from the New *Testament*, but also, from the Words of *R. Barclay* and *Joseph Besse*, when compar'd and considered, that the Apostle *Paul, baptized* with *Water*, both at *Ephesus* and *Corinth*, according to *Christ's Commission*. And, this I think, will also, plainly appear, from the Passage itself. For, can any Person on due Consideration, suppose, that the Apostle would afterwards take such Care, to set the *Disciples* at *Ephesus* right,—as well as before at *Corinth*, to practice *Water-Baptism* in that *religious* and *solemn* Manner, as *in the Name* of his *Lord* and *Master*; if, he had not *a divine Commission*, and Authority so to do. From all which, I think it abundantly appears, if we will allow, St. *Paul* to be consistent with himself, when he says,—*Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel:* I say, it's evident that the Word NOT in this *Text* is to be understood as a *comparative Term* of *Distinction*, and not of *Exclusion:* agreeable to the Words of the Lord by the *Prophet*; *For I desired Mercy and* NOT *Sacrifice: and the Knowledge of God*, MORE *than Burnt Offerings.* Hosea vi. 6.

Again, as the *Commission* of our Lord, was given to his Apostles, by which they were commanded to *preach* the Gospel, *Mark* xvi. 15.—the Doctrines of which, are *Faith in Christ, Repentance, Baptism,—Remission of Sins*, and the Promise, of the *Holy Ghost:* I say, these are some of the great *Doctrines* of the Gospel; which, we find the Apostle *Peter*, standing up WITH the ELEVEN; did by the *divine Influence* of the *Spirit*,—preach to the Multitude, at the Day of *Pentecost*. Acts. ii.—38. which *Baptism* here mentioned, both *Tho. Ellwood*, and *R. Barclay*, as before cited, own to be *Water-Baptism*. So that, according to the *Text*, and these *Authors*; it's evident,

that *Water-Baptiſm*, was compriſed in that *Goſpel*, which the commiſſioned Apoſtles of Chriſt did preach.

And as the Apoſtle *Paul*, was alſo *ſent to preach* the ſame *Goſpel*, as were the other Apoſtles, in which was contained the Doctrine of *Water-Baptiſm*, it's plain, that *Water-Baptiſm*, was compriſed in that *Commiſſion*, which *he* as an Apoſtle, and *Miniſter* of *Chriſt*, had likewiſe received. And, agreeable hereto, it's manifeſt, that *Paul* both *preached*, and practiſed *Water-Baptiſm*. For thus we read, *Acts* xviii. 8. *And Criſpus the chief ruler of the ſynagogue, believed on the Lord with all his houſe: and many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed, and were baptized.*

From hence, it's evident, that—the *Corinthians*, HEARING *Paul* preach, *believed*; and according to his Doctrine, were *baptized*; which *Baptiſm* is own'd by *Barclay*, in his Apology, p. 295. and by *J. Pike*, p. 107. to be *Water-Baptiſm*; and the *Quakers* in general, acknowledge that *Paul baptized Criſpus*, and ſome others of the *Corinthians*, with *Water*, agreeable to 1 *Cor.* i. 14, 16. So that it's plain, *Paul* did not only practice, but alſo, *preach Water-Baptiſm*. From hence, it's manifeſt, that *Water-Baptiſm* was contained in that *Goſpel*, which *Chriſt ſent* the Apoſtle to *preach*; and this conſidered, with the foregoing, make it abundantly clear, that *this Baptiſm* was contained in the Commiſſion, *Paul* received.

Again, ſuppoſe it was allow'd, that ſtrictly ſpeaking, *the* Apoſtle was not ſent to *baptize*,—yet, foraſmuch, as *Water-Baptiſm*, was contained in the *Doctrine* which he *preached*, it's evident, that that *Baptiſm* belonged to the *Goſpel Church*. I ſay, that if the above *Suppoſition* was allowed, yet then, it would be far from anſwering the *Quakers* Purpoſe. For, it would only ſhew, that as God had called, and in an extraordinary Manner, furniſhed the Apoſtle, by the *Gifts* of his *Spirit*, for the *Miniſtry* of the *Word*;—that his *main* or *principal* Buſineſs, was to attend thereto; and as an *Inſtrument* in the Hand of God, to prepare Perſons, by *Faith* and *Repentance*,

tance, that ſo, they may be mete for *Water-Baptiſm*,— agreeable to the *Tenor*, of our *Lord's Commiſſion*, as recorded *Mat.* xxviii. 19, 20. *Mark* xvi. 15, 16. and *Luke* xxiv. 47. According to which the *Apoſtles*, and *Diſciples* of Chriſt went forth, and *preached* the Doctrine of *Faith*, *Repentance*, and *Water-Baptiſm*.——From all which, it's abundantly manifeſt, that the *Term* NOT, 1 *Cor.* i. 17. is only a *Term* of *Diſtinction*, and not of *Excluſion*. And, the moſt that the *Quakers* can poſſibly make of it, is, *that, Chriſt did not abſolutely enjoin the Apoſtle, always to adminiſter Water-Baptiſm with his own Hands,—but, that he could juſtifiably, leave that to others, as he ſaw mete, or as Occaſion required*; as indeed, it's plain, that St. *Paul* did.

And when the Apoſtle ſays, *I thank God, that I baptized none of you, but Criſpus and Gaius: Leſt any ſhould ſay, that I had baptized in mine own Name. And I baptized alſo the houſhold of Stephanas: beſides, I know not whether I baptized any other*; it can't be ſuppoſed, that the Ground, of *Paul's Thanks* to *God*, was, that no more than *Criſpus*, *Gaius*, and the *Houſhold* of *Stephanas*, were *baptized*; for it's plain, that MANY *of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized.* Acts xviii. 8.

But, what was the Ground or Argument, of his being *glad*, or giving *Thanks* to *God*; appears, plain from his own Words; That *he himſelf* had *baptized* no more of THEM; for adds the Apoſtle, *Leaſt any ſhould ſay, that I baptized in mine own Name:* When, if he had *baptized* many of *them*, it's very like, the *Contentious* at *Corinth*, would have thus reproached the Apoſtle; but as God, in his Providence had ordered it otherwiſe, he was *glad*, and gave *Thanks to God*; that the *captious* Party, could have no Pretence on that Account.

And, as he had not *baptized* any in his *own Name*, it plainly intimates; that thoſe which he did *baptize*, he *baptized* in the *Name of Chriſt*; agreeable to *Acts* xix. 5. as before obſerved. And, ſince here is no Intimation, that the *Apoſtle* was any way diſſatisfied, or uneaſy, with

reſpect to his having adminiſtered *Water-Baptiſm*; his *thanking God*, as above,—is no Argument againſt *Water-Baptiſm*: Neither, does it prove that the Apoſtle had not a *Commiſſion* ſo to do. But, as it is ſo plain, that he baptized *in the Name of Chriſt*,---it's but reaſonable to conclude, that *Water-Baptiſm* was included, in that Commiſſion, which he received.

I next went on in my Diſcourſe, p. 25. to obſerve that " The Author to the *Hebrews*, when ſpeaking of " the firſt and *initial* Points of the Chriſtian Religion, " or *Principles of the Doctrines of Chriſt*, mentions the " *Doctrine of Baptiſms* in the Plural; on which Place " Mr. *Dell*, that eminent *Quaker*, in his *Piece*, entitled, " *The Doctrine of Baptiſms*, ſaith, *(a) Whence I perceived, that in the primitive Church, they had the Doctrine of Baptiſms in the plural Number.*" One of which he goes on and intimates, " was the *Baptiſm* of *Water*, the other " that of the *Spirit*; and agreeable hereto, ſaith another Author, *(b)* ſpeaking on the ſame Paſſage, who alſo brings in *Paſor*, on the ſame Text, ſaying, *Here the plural Number ſhews forth the outward and inward Baptiſm.*

In Anſwer to which *Joſeph Beſſe*, ſays p. 38. " The Sermon-Writer's Attempt is, p. 25. to wreſt the " Words of *William Dell*, (whom he miſ-calls *eminent Quaker*) who ſays, " that in the Primitive Church " they had the Doctrine of Baptiſms in the plural " Number," and of *Thomas Lawſon*, who ſays, " Here " the plural Number ſhews forth the *outward* and *inward* " Baptiſm," to a Sence directly contrary to that of thoſe " Authors, who plainly ſhew from Holy Scripture, that " the *outward Baptiſm* or *Baptiſm with Water*, was the " Baptiſm of *John*, not of CHRIST; and that the *inward Baptiſm* or *Baptiſm of the Spirit*, was the Baptiſm " of CHRIST, not of *John*: And that the *inward Bap-*

" *tiſm*

(a) P. 4, 5. *(b)* Tho. Lawſon, in his Treatiſe of Baptiſms, p. 9, 10, 13.

" *tiſm* or Baptiſm of the Spirit, is the *one* and *only* " Baptiſm abiding in Force under the Goſpel Diſpen- " ſation."

Now, in Anſwer to this I ſay, that as to my miſ-calling *W. Dell* when I called him a *Quaker*, as it's what I have anſwer'd to before; ſo likewiſe of the one Baptiſm, and therefore I ſhall not take Notice of it here again. The main Thing here, is, whether I can clear myſelf from the Charge which *Joſeph Beſſe* has laid againſt me; of *wreſting* the Words of *Dell*, and *Lawſon*, *to a Sence directly contrary to that of thoſe Authors*; when, they were ſpeaking with reſpect to the *Principles of the Doctrine of Chriſt*, mentioned *Heb.* vi. 12. " Whence " (ſays *Dell*) I perceived, that in the *primitive Church*, " they had the Doctrine of Baptiſms in the plural " Number." One of which, as I have ſaid above, he goes on and intimates was the *Baptiſm* of *Water*.—— Now, if he has not ſo done, then I am to *blame* for what I have inſerted: But if it ſhould appear to be a *Truth*, then it will be manifeſt that *Joſeph is a falſe Accuſer*. And, in order to bring this to a *fair Trial*, I will cite the Words of *Dell* ſomewhat more at large, p. 4, 5. of his *Doctrine of Baptiſms*, where ſpeaking with regard to his *Search* after *Truth*, ſays;

" Now, in this Inquiry from the Word, I met with " that *Heb.* vi. 2. where the Apoſtle ſpeaking of ſome " of the firſt and *initial* Points of CHRISTIAN RE- " LIGION, names—the *Doctrine* of *Baptiſms*; whence " I perceived that in the *Primitive Church* they had the " Doctrine of Baptiſms in the plural *Number*; and there- " fore did apply myſelf to ſearch from the Word what " theſe Baptiſms might be, and ſo met with the " *Baptiſt*'s own Doctrine, touching *Baptiſms*, mention'd " *Mat.* iii. *Mark* i."——

Now, as it's my Right, to ſtand up for, and to clear myſelf, from this Accuſation and Charge; I obſerve, that when *Dell* ſays, he " *met with the Baptiſt's own* " *Doctrine*, touching *Baptiſms*, mentioned *Mat.* iii.

" *Mark*

" *Mark* i." it's evident, that it was *Water-Baptiſm*, as well as *Spirit Baptiſm*, which *Dell* intended; and this plainly appears, from the Chapters cited, which relate to *John*'s baptizing the *People*, and our *Lord* in the *River Jordan*.——So that it's manifeſt I have not *wreſted Dell*'s Words to a Senſe contrary to that which he intended; and this I freely leave to the Judgment of my Reader.

And as to *Lawſon*, thus ſays he, p. 9, 10.—" In " *Heb.* vi. 2. the Apoſtle ſpeaking of ſome of the *initial* " *Points* of the *true Religion*, makes mention of the Doc- " trine of *Baptiſms*; not Baptiſm, but *Baptiſms*, in the " plural Number: and that theſe are *John*'s with *Water*, " and *Chriſt*'s with the *Spirit*, may be proved by a fruit- " ful and plentiful Harveſt of Teſtimonies."

From hence, I think it's plain, that *Lawſon* is ſpeaking here of the *Baptiſm* of *Water*, and that of the *Spirit*, both which he declares, the Apoſtle ſpeaks of *Heb.* vi. 2. And I can't but obſerve, that both *Dell*, and *Lawſon*, own, that *Water-Baptiſm*, was, according to the Apoſtle, an *initial Point* of the *Chriſtian or true Religion*. Now, as *Joſeph Beſſe* calls *Dell* an *enlightened Man*, and one that was " *enabled* to diſcover the TRUTH in " this *Point*,——with a convincing Evidence and Clear- " neſs;"——and *Lawſon*, being a Perſon of *Learning*; I can't but admire, that *Joſeph* ſhould thus oppoſe his *Friends*, and the *Truth*, in this *Point*: and not receive *Water-Baptiſm*, according to the *Apoſtle*, and *them*, to be an *Initial* of *Chriſtian Religion*; and a *Principle of the Doctrine of Chriſt*.

If indeed, *Dell* and *Lawſon*, have any where in their *Writings* contradicted this; that no way proves, that what I had ſaid was falſe: but only ſhews their own Inconſiſtency; and as ſuch, the more like my *Antagoniſt*.

And, *Lawſon*, p. 13. brings in " *Paſor* paraphraſing " on *Heb.* vi. 2. of the Doctrine of Baptiſms, ſaid, Here " the plural Number ſhews forth the outward and in- " ward Baptiſm."

Now,

Now, let *Joſeph* ſhew if he can, that I have *wreſted* the Sence of theſe Authors;——which if he cannot do, I charge him with *falſe* Accuſation; notwithſtanding his *dogmatical* Aſſertion: For it's evident, that, *Dell*, *Lawſon*, and his Author allow *Heb.* vi. 2. to intend *Water-Baptiſm*; as well as that of the *Spirit*.

And it's plain, that the two former do not only allow it ſo to be, but alſo, that *Water-Baptiſm*—was an *initial Point of the Chriſtian Religion*. And ſince it was ſo then, it muſt remain the ſame ſtill, unleſs *Joſeph* or his *Friends*,—can produce another *Goſpel* or *divine* Authority, by which it is declared, *null* or *void*.

But, p. 39. of his Exam. I find that *Joſeph Beſſe*, with reſpect to *Heb.* vi. 2. ſays,—" the Doctrine of *Baptiſms*, " which in the *primitive Church* was eſteemed a *Principle* " of Chriſtianity and tending to *Perfection*, was that *very* " *Doctrine* which *John* the *Baptiſt*, and Our *Saviour* him- " ſelf, had taught reſpecting *Baptiſm*, Mat. iii. Acts i. 5. " where they make a moſt plain Diſtinction and Separa- " tion between *Water-Baptiſm* and the *Baptiſm* with " *Holy-Ghoſt*."

But, in Anſwer to this, I ſay, that tho' I can't admit *Joſeph*'s Senſe of the Words " *Doctrine of Baptiſms*," yet, if I ſhould for the preſent allow, that the *diſtinguiſhing* between the two *Baptiſms*, was, that which was intended by the *Doctrine* thereof; yet then, that would not in the leaſt affect me, or my Argument for *Water-Baptiſm*; foraſmuch, as I believe, and freely acknowledge theſe two *Baptiſms*. And I think, *Joſeph* may eaſily diſtinguiſh (if his Judgment is not more than a little clouded) between *Water* and *Spirit-Baptiſm*, without ſuppoſing, *Water-Baptiſm* to be *null* or *void*.

And, tho' Our Saviour has, *Acts* i. 5. moſt plainly *diſtinguiſhed*,—between *Water-Baptiſm*, and the *Baptiſm* of the *Holy-Ghoſt*, yet, I obſerve, that there is a great Difference between a *Diſtinction*, and an *Abrogation*, or *Repealing*.—And the *diſtinguiſhing* between the two *Baptiſms*, contains no Argument that one of them is

diſ-

disannulled; as I have before largely obſerved, p. 59. 60. But before I leave this, I can't but take Notice, of the wonderful *Inference* that *Joſeph*—has drawn in his Anſwer to the *Vicar*, p. 278. where ſpeaking with regard to the Words of our Lord, *Acts* i. 5. *For John truly baptized with Water; but ye ſhall be baptized with the Holy Ghoſt, not many days hence:* Says, "*This is the true Doctrine of Bap-*"*tiſms, John's with Water, Chriſt's with the Holy Ghoſt.*" He then infers, ſaying, "If *then this Doctrine be* ONE "*of the Principles of the Doctrine of Chriſt, 'tis manifeſt* "*that his Baptiſm is to be retained, and John's laid a-*"*ſide.*"

What, this *Joſeph Beſſe* may be in ſome Caſes, I know not; but it appears to me, that he had no juſt Cauſe to *reflect* on others for their *Incapacity*;—unleſs, he had diſcovered greater *Abilities* himſelf. For, how *weak*, as well as unnatural is the above *Concluſion*; when it's plain, that the *Text* does only *diſtinguiſh* between the two *Baptiſms*; and contains not the leaſt Intimation, that any *one* of *them* was to *ceaſe*. If indeed, our *Lord* had when he diſtinguiſhed *them*, declared Water-Baptiſm to be *null*;---then I allow it ought to be laid aſide. But, as he was diſcourſing of the two *Baptiſms*, and mentioned not the leaſt of *Water-Baptiſm's*, being laid aſide; ---it's certainly, rather an Argument, that *Water-Baptiſm* was to continue.

And, as Water-Baptiſm is contained in the *Principles of the Doctrine of Chriſt*, and what was the repeated *Doctrine*, and *Practice* of the *Truly inſpired* Apoſtles; and that *in the Name of their Lord* and Maſter; I think nothing is more clear, or explanatory; than that *Water-Baptiſm*, was *the* Baptiſm, intended in our *Lord's Commiſſion*. For, no ſooner were the Apoſtles—*endowed* with the *Power* from on *High*, whereby they were capable to ſpeak with *other Tongues*;—but we find that *Peter* ſtood up WITH the ELEVEN, (as being the Mouth for them) and *preached* up *Jeſus Chriſt*, *Repentance*, and *Water-Baptiſm*.---And thus they went on, gathering

and

and ſettling the *Churches*, on the *Principles of the Doctrine of Chriſt*.

So that here I ſhall venture to add, as in p. 25, 26, and 27. of my Diſcourſe on *Water-Baptiſm*, that, " ſince " the *outward*, as well as the *inward Baptiſm*, was that " which they had in the *Primitive Church*, and was one of " the *Initial Points* thereinto, may I not call on the QUA- " KERS, to juſtify their pretended *Entrance* into *Chriſt's* " *Church* without IT? and alſo to ſhew, by what *Au-* " *thority* they not only neglect it themſelves, but en- " courage and teach others ſo to do; when it ſo plainly " appears to be a *Goſpel Ordinance*, not only from the " above *Author's Conceſſions*, that it was one of the *Initial* " *Points* into the *Chriſtian*, or *true Religion*; but alſo, as " it moſt principally appears ſo to be, from the *Doc-* " *trine* and *Practice* of the *inſpired Apoſtles*; who we are " certain had the *Spirit* of *Truth*, by which they were " led, not only to recommend, but alſo to practice *Water-* " *Baptiſm*; and to rank it in with the other *Principles, of* " *the Doctrine of Chriſt. (a)* And, indeed, it is Matter " of Admiration to me, that Perſons ſhould conclude " otherwiſe; eſpecially, when I conſider, that our Lord " himſelf was thus baptized; and, by his Diſciples " practiſed *Water-Baptiſm:* For we are told by the ſa- " cred Record, That, *After theſe Things came Jeſus and* " *his diſciples into the land of Judea, and there he tarried* " *with them, and baptized. (b) And they came unto John,* " *and ſaid unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond* " *Jordan, to whom thou bearеſt witneſs, behold, the ſame* " *baptizeth, and all men come to him. (c)* Which was " certainly the *Baptiſm* of *Water: For the Holy Ghoſt was* " *not* then *given, becauſe that Jeſus was not then glorified.* " *(d)* And, he alſo gave a *Baptiſm* in *Commiſſion* to his " Apoſtles, a little before his *Aſcenſion*; who well knew " their Lord's Intention therein; and accordingly, when

(a) Heb. vi. 1, 2. (b) John iii. 22. (c) Ver. 26. *That is, by the Agency of his Apoſtles.* (d) John vii. 39.

" they were *endued with the Power from on High*, did " *preach the Goſpel, taught* and *practiſed*, among other " Things, the *Baptiſm* with *Water*; the Conſideration " of which, I think, is the *beſt* Way, to come at the " Knowledge of our *Saviour's Mind*, in his *Commiſſion*; " even to obſerve HIS, and the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of " his *immediate Apoſtles*; which they performed *in his* " *Name:* And this Method I take to be *ſafer*, than to " truſt to the Pretenſions or *Notions* of any, who can- " not ſhew, ſo good Evidence as the Apoſtles did; that " they have received, and are *led by the Spirit of Truth:* " And therefore, whatſoever any may ſay, by way of " oppoſing the Practice of *Water-Baptiſm*; it is not to " be eſteemed or regarded as of equal Authority, to the " *Doctrine* and *Practice* of the *inſpired Apoſtles*, who " taught, and practiſed *Water-Baptiſm*, and are never " in the *Scripture*, ſaid to have *baptized* any other Way: " So that, I think, we may juſtly conclude, that the " Apoſtles did thus underſtand their *Lord* in his *Com-* " *miſſion*; and in Obedience thereto, when they were " *baptized with the Spirit*, went forth, *preached*, and *prac-* " *tiſed* accordingly, the *Baptiſm of Water*; and with this " *beginning Principle* was the firſt *Chriſtian Churches* ga- " thered."

And, as to *Joſeph*'s pretending, p. 39, 40. that *Water-Baptiſm* is a *Jewiſh Obſervation* or *Rite*,—and alſo that the Apoſtle " call'd it a *Carnal Ordinance*, and only " *impoſed until the Time of Reformation*," I ſay, as to this, it's utterly *denied*; and let *Joſeph* prove if he can, that the BAPTISM, *preached* and *practiſed* by the Apoſtles, was a *Jewiſh Obſervation*,—or, that it was any of thoſe *Carnal Ordinances*, intended by the Apoſtle, *Heb.* ix. 10. and until he has done this, his *bare Aſſertion*, will be but of little *Weight*; eſpecially, as there is no great Reaſon to conclude, that he was *dictated* in his Writings, by that *Spirit*, by which the *Scriptures* was given forth. Foraſmuch, as his Writings abound with *Calumny*, *Reviling*, and *Inconſiſtency* with itſelf.——Beſides, *W.*

Penn,

Penn, Vol. ii. p. 832. ſpeaking of *Water-Baptiſm*, calls it " a Practice *introduced* by *John*;"—and enlightened *Dell*, ſays, p. 13, 14. " *John* was the *Author* or FIRST " *Miniſter* of a NEW and *unwonted* Baptiſm;"—and in p. 6. he ſignifies, that it was the *Newneſs* of *John*'s Baptiſm, that raiſed the *Expectation of the People*,—and it's evident, that the Baptiſm theſe Authors there intend, is *Water-Baptiſm*; But how that can be a *Jewiſh Rite*, I ſee not, ſince, it was *a new*, and *unwonted* Baptiſm, *introduced by John*.——

Again, as *Water-Baptiſm* is by the Apoſtle, included in the *Principles of the Doctrine of Chriſt*; can it be thought, that he would call it afterwards in the ſame *Epiſtle*, a *Carnal Ordinance*, (as *J. Beſſe* phraſes it) and only *impoſed until the Time of Reformation?* when, the Time of *Reformation*, had long *commenced*, before the Apoſtle wrote that *Epiſtle*, in which he includes *Water-Baptiſm* in the *Principles of Chriſt's Doctrine!*

And, p. 27, 28. of mine on *Water-Baptiſm*, I went on by way of Application, exhorting, that Chriſtians would be careful that they were not *toſſed to and fro, and carried about by every Wind of Doctrine*,—that they would endeavour to ground themſelves in the *Truth*, by a thorough Acquaintance with the *ſacred Oracles* of the *Chriſtian Religion*, joined with ſincere *Prayer to Almighty God*, for the kind Influences of his *Spirit*; that ſo they might be enabled, not only to vindicate the *Truth*, but be alſo *furniſhed for every good Word and Work*; that they would not reſt on the *Externals* of Religion, but have regard to the *Life* and *Power* of *Godlineſs*;—obſerving, that if Baptiſm,—was not attended with a *religious Life*, it would *avail* the Soul no more, than the *Externals* under the Law, did the *Jews*, when they were not accompanied with a ſuitable Diſpoſition of Mind, and a holy Life.——

Laſtly, I conclude, ſaying, " let us always remem- " ber the Words of the Apoſtle *Peter*, who, when he is " ſpeaking of Perſons being ſaved in *Noah's Ark*, ſaith, " *The like figure whereunto, even baptiſm, doth alſo now ſave*

" *us (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the an-*
" *swer of a good conscience towards God) by the resurrection*
" *of Jesus Christ. (a)* In which Words the Apostle doth
" distinguish between the Act of this Gospel, and figu-
" rative Baptism, which, he saith, *doth now save us*, (that
" is a Way or Means) and the *Principle* from whence
" that and all *Acts* of Obedience to God ought to spring;
" shewing that the *saving* Nature of this *Baptism*, doth
" not consist in the bare Act of washing the Body with
" Water; but as that *religious Act* is done in Obedience
" to God, and flows from, and is attended with, the
" Answer of a good Conscience towards him therein:
" And wheresoever this is the Case, they may have a
" well-grounded Hope of *Salvation, by the Resurrection of*
" *Jesus Christ*; which God of his Mercy grant we may
" all enjoy, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Now, in reply to this last, *Joseph* has inserted, a long Paragraph from *R. Barclay*'s Apology, p. 419, 420, 421. in which Pages, *Barclay* has at large given his Interpretation of the above-mention'd *Text*, 1 *Pet.* iii. 21. which, on perusal, does not appear to be worthy any particular Answer; and I can't but admire, that *Joseph* should give it a Place in his *Exam.* forasmuch as *Barclay*, has therein made Use of several *unscriptural Terms*, which according to *Joseph*, is *a Sign that Barclay was obtruding upon others his own erroneous Notions*,—See *Exam.* 15, 16.—— So that I think, he has given his *Friend*'s, Interpretation, a home *Stroak*.——Again, where do we read in the *Scriptures*, of the *Fire of God's Judgment burning up the unrighteous Nature*: which, I take the Liberty to tell him, as he doth the *Vicar* in a like Case, p. 30. that these " *Words he never found together in holy Writ.*"—And when I consider, how *captious Joseph*—is with his Opponents, I can't but admire, that he and his *Friends*, should so often make Use of unscriptural Phrases, in *religious* Affairs; and of their *carping*, or finding Fault with others, for so doing. And what can be thought less, than that they

(a) 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21.

they, would fain *appropriate* to themſelves a *Right* ſo to do; and at the ſame Time, take the Liberty to *cenſure* others for the ſame Practice; not regarding the Apoſtle's Words, *Rom.* ii. 1.——

And farther, *Barclay* tells thoſe that conclude *Water-Baptiſm* to be intended in this *Text*, that " they will not " ſay, that all that have it, are ſaved by *Water-Baptiſm*; " which (ſays he) they OUGHT to ſay, if they will " underſtand by *Baptiſm* (by which the Apoſtle ſaith, " *we are ſaved)* Water-Baptiſm."

Anſ. But, why OUGHT thoſe, that think it's *Water-Baptiſm to ſay, that all that have it are ſaved by it*, any MORE than *Barclay*, who concluded it to intend *Spirit Baptiſm*, and yet plainly ſuppoſeth, that ſome might miſcarry, notwithſtanding, they might be *baptized* with it; for ſays he, "—Many, by the Confeſſion of all, are *baptized* with *Water*, " that are not ſaved: *But this Conſequence* (he ſays) *holds* " MOST *true, if it be underſtood as we do, of the Baptiſm* " *of the Spirit, ſince none can have this Anſwer of a good Con-* " *ſcience, and* ABIDING *in it, not be ſaved by it.*"

Now, from *Barclay*'s own Words it's plain, that tho' Perſons may be *baptized* with the *Spirit*, yet, that ſome of them might not be *ſaved*; which, is evidently implied, from his ſaying, that it—" *holds moſt true,*" and of their " *abiding in it*;" which Expreſſions of his plainly ſuppoſe, that it's not always *true*, tho' it may be, *moſtly true*, and alſo, that if Perſons do not *abide in it* (viz. *a good Conſcience*) they will not be *ſaved by Spirit Baptiſm.* Therefore, I ſay, I would fain know, why they that hold this *Text* relates to *Water-Baptiſm*, OUGHT *to ſay*, that *all that have it, are ſaved by it*, any MORE, than the *Quakers*, who pretend it's *Spirit Baptiſm*; when it's plain as above, that *Barclay* allows, that ſome ſo *baptized* may not be *ſaved*; and that their *Salvation* is conditional, *viz.* their having the Anſwer of a *good Conſcience*, and *abiding in it?*—and yet but a little before, he ſays,—" ſeeing we are ſaved by this *Baptiſm*, " as ALL thoſe that were in the Ark *were ſaved by Wa-*

" *ter*;

" *ter*; it would *(says he)* then follow, that ALL those " that have this *Baptism*, are saved by it."

Thus, it may be seen, how *perplext* and *confused*— Persons are, when they are about to *obtrude their own erroneous Notions.*

For, at one Time, according to *Barclay*, the *Salvation* of this *Baptism* is *conditional*; at another Time, it's *sure* or *certain*, " *as all those that were in the Ark were saved by Water*;" which, according to the *sacred Record*, was every *Soul*. Thus, I say, it may be clearly seen, how *inconsistent*, and *confused* Men are, when they are about to *pervert* the *sacred Text*; and would fain exclude, *Water-Baptism*, from the *Gospel of Christ*; in which, it's held forth, so *conspicuous*, and plain. And indeed, I know of no *Sect* of *professed Christians*, that are more *confused*, or *divided*, in any one *Point*, than are the *Quakers* in this of *Baptism*; notwithstanding, their *high* Pretentions, to *Oneness* of *Mind*, and *Judgment:* as may be observed, from the foregoing Passages; and from what will hereafter follow.

But first, see *Examination*, p. 17. where *Joseph Besse* says, " The Variety of Opinions both about the Mode " and Subjects of *Water-Baptism*, sufficiently shews, that " it is not a Doctrine clearly revealed, much less a " Christian Duty."

In Answer to which, I say, that if the *Variety* of *Opinions* about *Water-Baptism*, do sufficiently shew, that it is not a *Doctrine clearly revealed*, much less a *Christian Duty:* I say, that if it be so; then, I think, it will also follow, that if there be the like *Variety* of *Opinions* (which there is, and that amongst the *Quakers* themselves) about the *Baptism* which they so much talk of, and pretend to, it will then, in like Manner, according to him, *sufficiently shew*, that THEIR Notions of *Spirit Baptism* is not *clearly revealed*, much less a *Christian Doctrine.*

I might here first, go on to enquire, whether *Joseph*'s above *Conclusion*, be just, from the *Premises*; but, as I can't

can't obſerve, he hath much Regard to that, I ſhall proceed by Way of *Retortion*; viz. returning the like Argument,—that ſo *he* and his *Friends* may conſider, whether they like to take, what they are ſo forward to give: and not only ſo, but, that they may come to ſee how *perplext*, and *confuſed* they are, with reſpect to *Baptiſm*; notwithſtanding, they pretend ſo much to *Unity* of *Spirit*, and *Oneneſs* of *Mind* and Judgment; even, ſo as to be *all of one Mind, and all ſpeak, write and witneſs the ſame Thing*;— that they are *in all their Ways, Doctrine and Practice but as one Man*:—See *James Jackſon's ſtrong Man arm'd*, &c. p. 14. I ſay, that notwithſtanding all theſe *great Pretentions*, to *Unity*, and *Oneneſs*, I hope they may be brought to ſee, that quite the contrary, is the Truth of their Caſe; foraſmuch, as it is really ſo: as I truſt will appear, from the following *Quotations*.

And firſt, with regard to the *Commencement*, of *Spirit Baptiſm*, the enlightened *Dell*, in his Doctrine of Baptiſms, p. 8, 9. ſays, " The Scripture ſaith, that *Chriſt's* " *Baptiſm* was to follow *John's*, and did *not* accompany " it at the ſame Time, for *Mat.* iii. *John* ſaith,—*I do* " *baptize you with Water, but he that comes after me*, i. e. " in order of Time,—*he* SHALL *baptize you.*—Luke iii. " —Which Places *(ſays he)* plainly declare *Chriſt's* " *Baptiſm* did *not* go along with *John's*, but was to *follow* " it; and that he was to *baptize* with the *Spirit, after* " *John's* Water-Baptiſm had had it's *full Courſe*, to wit, " WHEN he was *riſen* from the *Dead*, and aſcended " into Heaven." And ſpeaking in reference to *Acts* i. 4, 5.—ſays, " *Baptiſm with the Spirit* was NOT ful- " filled, *but* was *ſhortly* to be fulfilled, as appears, *Acts* " i. 4. 5."—and this was fulfilled at the Day of *Pente-* " *coſt.*"——P. 22, 23. he plainly intimates, that Spirit Baptiſm *began* not till after the *Aſcenſion* of Chriſt.—From hence it's evident, that *Dell* concluded *Spirit Baptiſm* did not *begin*, till after our Lord's Aſcenſion, or till the Day of *Penticoſt*, Acts ii.—So likewiſe *Lawſon*,

on

on Baptiſm, p. 10, 11, 40. where ſays he,—" *after* Chriſt's " Aſcenſion, Chriſt's Baptiſm *began.*"---And p. 45. to the ſame Purpoſe. See alſo p. 46, 52, 54. And *R. Barclay*, Apology, p. 282. ſpeaking in reference to *Acts* i. 4, 5. and of the Apoſtles being *baptized* with *Water*, ſays,---" although they were formerly baptized with " the *Baptiſm of Water*, yet NOT with that of Chriſt " which they *were to be baptized* with." So likewiſe, *Joſiah Martin*'s Appendix to the Great Caſe of *Tythes*, p. 175. But *Tho. Lancaſter*, that late and noted Author, in his *True Spiritual Baptiſm*, &c. p. 69. ſays,---" WE " in our Turn *(ſays he)* do *inſiſt* upon it, that the puri- " fying Operation of the *holy Spirit was*, *in the Days of* " *Chriſt's viſible Appearance*, *Baptiſm* with the *Holy Ghoſt*, " as well as after his Suffering, Reſurrection, and Aſcen- " ſion,"---he goes on ſeveral Pages to the ſame Pur- poſe, and p. 73. he boldly ſays,---" that the Believers " in Chriſt *were baptized* with the *Holy Ghoſt* BEFORE " the Day of Penticoſt as *well* as *after*."

Now, from hence it's evident, that, *Dell*, *Lawſon*, *Barclay*, and *Martin*, conclude, that what the *New Teſta- ment* calls the *Baptiſm* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, or that of the *Spirit*, did NOT *commence* till *Penticoſt*; and that the Diſciples was NOT ſo baptized, *till that Time*. But, *Lancaſter* declares *quite the contrary*, as above.

Secondly, *Tho. Lancaſter*, p. 23. ſpeaking of the *Com- miſſion*, ſays, "---*Name* or *Power*,---are ſynonymous, and therefore the *Commiſſion*, WE preſume is *literal*, not " *figurative*."——So again, p. 25. and adds,---" neither " can what is *literal* be *figurative* to."----P. 41. he ſpeaks expreſly to the ſame Purpoſe.——But, ſays *Joſiah Mar- tin*, in his *Appendix* to the great Caſe of *Tythes*, p. 179. that, " it evidently appears by two of the *Evangeliſts*, " that Chriſt us'd the Word *Baptiſm* in his laſt Diſ- " courſe, not in a *literal* Senſe of *Water-Baptiſm*, but in " a *figurative* Senſe, to denote the *Power* and Operation " of the Spirit."——P. 180.---'Tis *(ſays he)* more " likely, that the Apoſtles and Diſciples took thoſe " Words,

" Words, not in a *literal* but *figurative* Sence, to de-
" note the *Baptiſm* and *Power* of the *Spirit*."——

Thus, it's plain, that *Lancaſter*, will have the *Com-miſſion* be underſtood, to be *literal*; not *figurative*. But *Martin*, he will have it quite the reverſe, *viz.* not in a *literal*, but in a *figurative* Sence.

Thirdly, Joſiah Martin, in the above-mentioned Book, p. 169. ſpeaking of the Sentiment of his *Friends* the *Quakers*, ſays, " By the *Baptiſm* of the *Spirit*, they un-
" derſtand a waſhing, or purifying, of the Soul from
" evil Thoughts and vile Affections."—And ſays *Joſeph Beſſe*, in his Anſwer to the *Vicar*, p. 280.—" the pro-
" per *Goſpel Senſe* of Baptiſm, is the *waſhing or purifying*
" of the Heart, the *purging of the Conſcience from dead*
" *Works*."——

But, ſays, that *Great Man of God and Prince in Iſrael*, GEORGE FOX, (as *William Pen* is pleaſed to call him) in his Journal, p. 570. " that People muſt *repent*
" BEFORE they do *believe*, and are *baptized*, and *before*
" they receive the Holy Ghoſt,—they—muſt be *turned*
" *from Darkneſs to the Light of Chriſt*, and *from the Power*
" *of Satan unto God*, BEFORE they do *receive* his *holy*
" *Spirit*, and Goſpel of Life and Salvation."

And *W. Wilkinſon*, in his Anſwer to *Joſeph Jenks*, p. 39. ſays,—" If I ſhould endeavour to prove that
" any were *baptized* with the *Holy Ghoſt*, BEFORE their
" *Sins* were *waſhed* away, I ſhould argue againſt my own
" Judgment."——

Here likewiſe, is a manifeſt Difference, in that *Martin*, and *Beſſe*, own and declare, that *Spirit Baptiſm*, is a *waſhing* and *purifyirg* of the Soul, from evil Thoughts, and vile Affections; and is the *purging* of the Conſcience from *dead* Works. But, *Fox*, and *Wilkinſon*, ſay, that Perſons muſt FIRST *be turned from Darkneſs to the Light of Chriſt*, and from the *Power of Satan unto God*,---and have *their Sins waſhed away*, BEFORE they *receive* the *Holy Ghoſt*, or *Spirit Baptiſm*. So that, what one calls

Spirit Baptiſm, muſt take Place, *before*, what the other calls ſo, can be received.

And, I might thus go on, and obſerve much more of the ſame Nature; but here is enough, to ſhew, that *Joſeph Beſſe*, had no great Reaſon to argue, that becauſe there is a *Variety* of *Opinions* about *Water-Baptiſm*, that therefore "*it is not a Doctrine clearly revealed, much leſs* "*a Chriſtian's Duty.*" I ſay, he had not much Reaſon ſo to do, unleſs, he, and his *Friends*, in the *Point* of *Baptiſm*, had been more *unanimous* themſelves: For notwithſtanding what *J. Jackſon*, was pleaſed to ſay, yet it's evident, that the *Quakers*, are far from being ALL of *one Mind* and *Judgment*; that they do not *ſpeak*, *write*, nor yet *witneſs*, the ſame Thing;---tho' they pretend ſo to do!

And, this will yet farther appear, by obſerving their Judgments, on ſome particular *Texts* of *Scripture*; and firſt, of the *Commiſſion*, which *Lancaſter*, (as before obſerved) underſtands in a *literal* Sence, but *Martin*, in a *figurative* Sence.

And, the *Baptiſm* mentioned *Acts* ii. 38. *Joſeph Beſſe*, denies to be *Water-Baptiſm*; and ſignifies, that it intends THE—*Converſion of the Soul to God. Exam.* p. 12, 29, 30. in which laſt Page, he is very expreſs, ſaying, "'tis "evident that *Water-Baptiſm* was NOT the Baptiſm "enjoined in this *Text.*"

But, *Barclay*, Apology, p. 295. and *Pike*, on *Baptiſm*, p. 107. likewiſe, *Tho. Ellwood*, in his ſacred Hiſtory, p. 502. theſe *Quakers* all allowed *Acts* ii. 38. to relate to *Water-Baptiſm*. And, the laſt of theſe Authors, calls it *John's*, *Baptiſm*.

And farther, the like may be obſerved with reſpect to the *Baptiſm* of *Paul*, mentioned *Acts* ix. 17, 18. and xxii. 16. which *Joſeph Beſſe*, will have be "meant of "*baptizing* with the *Holy Ghoſt.*" p. 287. to the *Vicar.* But, *J. Pike*, declares it to be *Water-Baptiſm*, as p. 90. and expreſly ſays "*Ananias adviſed Paul to be baptized* "*therewith.*"——

Again,

Again, *Joſeph Beſſe* in his Exam. p. 25, 38. explains *Acts* xix. 5. to intend, the *Baptiſm* of the *Holy Ghoſt*. But, *Barclay*, in his Apology, p. 295. ranks it in among other *Texts*, as that which relates to *Water-Baptiſm*. And thus, I might farther go on, ſhewing the *Diviſion*, and apparent *Contradiction*, there is among the *Quakers*; and in particular, between *Joſeph Beſſe*, and his *Friends*: So that, if what *Tho. Lancaſter*, ſpeaking of the *holy Scriptures* be true, who ſays, p. 79. "*nor doth the holy* "*Spirit in this our Day reveal any Thing contradictory to* "*them*;" I ſay, if this be true, (which I think none will deny) it's evident, that either *Joſeph Beſſe*, or his *Friends*, was not in theſe things, *led* by the *holy Spirit*, foraſmuch as they are in their declared Sentiments, ſo directly oppoſite, to one another.

Laſtly, I can't but obſerve, that *Joſeph Beſſe*, in his *Exam.* &c. does often repreſent, *Water-Baptiſm*, but as a *Carnal Ordinance*, and *a Jewiſh Rite* or *Ceremony*, thereby inſinuating, that it's a *lifeleſs Form*, and an empty *Shadow*, --- when his *Friend James Naylor*, in his *Piece* called *Milk* for *Babes*, &c. p. 14. ſpeaking of entering into the *Kingdom of Heaven*, ſays, "——ONLY he that "hath been faithful in the *Baptiſm of John*, to fulfil *all* "*Righteouſneſs*, ſhall receive *Power* to preſs into the "*Kingdom*."--- and in his *Love to the Loſt*, *&c.* p. 53. ſpeaking of the Apoſtles *baptizing* with *Water* ſays,—— "Neither did they lay it upon all, as of *abſolute Neceſſi*- "*ty*, but as they ſaw it *uſeful*; and could forbear, *in* "*caſe* IT was *idolized*."

Now, it's plain, if *Naylor*'s Words are to be regarded; that the *inſpired Apoſtles*, did lay *Water-Baptiſm* however upon ſome, *as of abſolute Neceſſity*,--- tho' they could forbear, in *caſe* it *was idolized*: which alſo, I think fairly implies; that where the Apoſtles, did not ſee it *idolized*; they could not forbear, but laid it on Perſons, *as of abſolute Neceſſity*; nay, and as above, according to *Nailor*, *Faithfulneſs*, in the *Baptiſm of John*, (which was Water-Baptiſm, as well as in other Things) *is neceſſary*,

in order to *enter into the Kingdom of Heaven!* But, how here to reconcile *Joseph*, and *James*, I leave.——

However, if against this *Inference*, it should be objected, that *James Naylor*, did not so intend it, and that another Sence may be gathered from other Parts of his Work;---I answer, That whether he so intended it, or not, it's plain, that the above *Inference*, is a most *natural* and *unstrained* Sence of his Words: And if he has said any thing elsewhere, which contradicts this, it sheweth, that he was not always dictated by the *Spirit of Truth*; or, that he was a careless Writer; and also, that it's the more like, the *Quakers* Scheme, in the Point of *Baptism*; which is, as hath been observed, much *confused*; and *contradictory*.

Thus, I have in all Plainness, gone through what I at present design; and trust that I have answer'd to the *Title Page*, viz. have vindicated *Water-Baptism*, by the *Doctrine*, and Practice of the *inspired Apostles*; and from the *Testimonies*, of several of the most *eminent Authors*, of the People call'd *Quakers*;---whose Words (*viz.* the Quakers) I have made use of in order to gain their Attentions; well knowing, they pay a *high* Regard to their *Writings*; and I hope, that if they will read impartially, they may (or at least some of them) come to see, not only, the *Inconsistency* of their *Scheme*, in this POINT; but also, that *Water-Baptism* is an *Ordinance* of the *Gospel Church*.

To conclude, *I heartily wish*, that the *Quakers*, who pretend so much to a *divine supernatural Light*;---would seriously consider, that, these afore-mentioned *Inconsistencies*, and *Contradictions*, with respect to the *Baptism* of *Water*; and that of the *Spirit, are not of God*;---and therefore, that either *Joseph Besse*, or his *Friends*, were in their *Writings*, *led* by the *Spirit* of *Error:* Forasmuch, as they therein do manifestly, not only *contradict* one another; but also the *Scriptures* of *Truth*.

And, I also desire, that they would *duly* reflect, on what *R. Barclay*, in his Apology, printed in the Year 1678, p. 51. speaking concerning the *Scriptures* saith,

"We

" We do look upon THEM as the ONLY fit outward
" *Judge of Controverſies* among *Chriſtians*, and that what-
" ſoever *Doctrine* is contrary unto their *Teſtimony*, may
" juſtly be rejected as *falſe*. —— We ſhall alſo be very
" willing *(ſays he)* to admit it, as a *poſitive* certain *Maxim*,
" *That whatſoever any do, pretending to the Spirit, which is*
" *contrary to the Scriptures, be accounted and reckoned a De-*
" *luſion of the Devil.*"

I ſay, I deſire they would *reflect*, and conſider *ſeriouſly*, on theſe Things;---for the above-mentioned *Contradictions*, are FACTS; which *cannot be denied*. And, I *intreat them*, that they would for the *future*, be more careful, leaſt they ſhould be found, to *father* their *own contradictory Notions*, upon the *unerring Spirit* of God.

If againſt what I have offered, *Joſeph Beſſe* ſhould have ought to ſay,---I truſt, that I ſhall not be unwilling to attend thereto; whether, it be from the *Preſs*, or otherwiſe. And tho' he hath with reſpect to this *Controverſy*, repreſented *me* in his *Exam.* p. 41. as a *Perſon*, whom *he* and his *Friends*, " *eſteem altogether unqualified for that Pur-*
" *poſe:*"

Yet, I would not have him ſuppoſe, that I am *thus* to be frighten'd,---from endeavouring, to *defend* the *Truth*, according to the *Abilities received:* But am willing, as Occaſion may require, farther to enter the *Liſt* with him, in this Affair; concluding,---that it's not impoſſible for ſuch, who may be---*eſteemed weak and fooliſh*, to *confound* the *conceited*, and *imaginary Wiſe*. For, as *Joſeph Beſſe* himſelf ſays,---ſo I believe, that,---" *Men*
" *of Learning, are but Men, and as ſubject to Error as others,*
" *it may happen, and has often happened, that they may miſ-*
" *apply their Talents in defending their own Miſtakes, and*
" *ſo diſhonour themſelves.*"---Which to me, appears to be *Joſeph*'s Caſe. An Inſtance of which, in the Room of many more,—is, in that *Joſeph* denies the *Baptiſm* mentioned *Acts* ii. 38. to intend *Water-Baptiſm*, and inſinuates, *Exam.* p. 30. that ſo to underſtand it, is *Arrogancy*, and *Preſumption*; and not only ſo, but is alſo *aſſuming*

a Power to set aside the Gospel Duty of Conversion of the Heart, —when his OWN Friends, *Barclay*, *Pike*, and *Ellwood*, as is before shewn, own'd, and declared, that it is *Water-Baptism* there intended: and therefore, if so to understand it, is *assuming* the above-mentioned *Power*, —and is *Arrogancy*, and *Presumption*; who more *assuming*,—*arrogant*, and *presumptuous*, than were these, his three Friends? But, as these three *Quakers*, were all *eminent*, and two of them *learned* Persons; I say, if their Judgments are to be regarded,—then it's evident, that, tho' *Joseph*, is a Person of *Learning*; yet it's plain, that he is as *subject to Error as others*; and also, that it *has so happened, that he misapplies his Talents*, in defending *his own Mistakes*.—Which, whether it be to his *Honour*, or *Dishonour*, I leave for him to consider.

And, as he ends his Preface, to his *Edinburgh* Antagonist, so with little *Variation*, will I here conclude this, ---that, " *I have adventur'd to oppose my Thoughts to his*, " *not without Hope, that the superior Force of Scripture and* " *Reason, both which I think to be on my Side, may gradually* " *dispel the Mists of* Enthusiasm, *and illuminate the Minds* " *of* some *to the Acknowledgment and Obedience of the* " *Truth.*"

POSTSCRIPT.

HAving some Room left, and being willing, to be as useful as possible; I shall fill up this Page, in such a Manner, as I hope, will in somewhat answer that End.

Joseph Besse in his *Defence of Quakerism*, p. 268. cites his *Friend R. Claridge*, saying, " *John's Baptism was with* " *Water, and was a Type or Figure. Christ's Baptism is* " *with the Holy Ghost, and is the Antitype or Thing figur'd.*"

And, I find the *Quakers* in general allow, that *Water-Baptism*, was in Force throughout *John's Ministry*, (as they are pleased to phrase it) or according to many of *them*, 'till *Penticost*.

Now,

Now, that they may come to see the *absurd* Consequence of their *Notions*; or the *Confusion*, and *Inconsistency*, there is among *them*; I desire it may be observed, that *J. Besse* in his *Examination* of a late *Vindication*, &c. p. 47. argues, that *Christ baptized* with the *Spirit*, before, or at least, from the Time of his being *baptized* of *John*, and for Proof, cites the Words of *John* to our Lord, *Mat.* iii. 14.—*I had need to be baptized of thee*,—and also, *John* i. 33. And to the same Purpose, speaks *Tho. Lancaster*, p. 69. 73. So that according to these *Quakers*, it's evident, that *Water-Baptism*, which they call the *Type*; was in Force, together with *Spirit-Baptism*; which by *them*, is also call'd, the *Antitype*: The absurd Consequence of which, according to *R Claridge*, as cited by *J. Besse*, in his *Defence of Quakerism*, p. 267. is, "*to set up the first Tabernacle again with it's Figures*,—— "*and to justify the Jews in their Meats* and Drinks, and "divers Washings."——

Now, the only Way that I know of, for the *Quakers* to clear themselves, from this Absurdity,—is, for *them* openly to renounce their *Notion*, of *Water-Baptism*, being a *Type* or *Figure* of *Spirit Baptism*; and also, to acknowledge, that both *Baptisms* may without any *Absurdity*, at least on that Account, be in Force together. Which, if duly consider'd, I hope may, by the *Blessing* of *God*, be a *preparatory* Means, to *their* Reception of the TRUTH.

D. D.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

IN Page 12, Line 2, for Water-Baptisms, read, Water-Baptism. p. 19, l. 27, for Apostles, read, Apostle's. p. 21, l. 31. for Apostles, read, Apostle. l. 32, for, this Baptism, read, the Baptism. p. 23, l. 35, for p. 21, read, p. 25. p. 32. l. 31, for Ver. read, Vol. p. 52, l. 18, for Acts ii. 3, read, Acts viii. 3. p. 54, l. 1, for Ver. read, Vol. p. 62, l. 35, for Apostles, read Apostle. p. 67, l. 20, for *Cornelus*, read, *Cornelius*. And so p. 68, l. 11, p. 72, l. 10, for *Commnition*, read, *Commission*. p. 83, l. 1, for may, read, might; and for mete, read meet. And l. 13, for mete, read, meet. p. 87, l. 20, after with, add, the.

The following Treatises are wrote by the Author DANIEL DOBEL, *and sold at his House in* Cranbrook; *and at the Printing Office in* Canterbury.

I. THE Seventh-Day SABBATH not Obligatory on Christians. In Five Parts. Together with a particular Examination of some Passages in a Book, entitled, *The Ancient and Honourable Way.* And some Remarks of a Piece, entitled, *The Seventh-Day Sabbath farther Vindicated.* And another entitled, *A Second Defence.*

II. An APPENDIX, containing ANSWERS to OBJECTIONS, and likewise an Examination of Mr. ELWALL's Chief Argument for the *Continuation of the Seventh-Day Sabbath.* Also, a particular Vindication of CHRISTIANS observing the *First Day for Publick and Assembly Worship.* And that from the NEW TESTAMENT, and the following *Antiquities* of the *Church.*

III. The PLEA for Infants Baptism, IMPLEADED: or, REMARKS on a Piece, intitled, *A* PLEA *for* INFANTS: or, *The Scripture Doctrine of* WATER BAPTISM *Stated.*

IV. INFANTS Sprinkling, an Unscriptural Doctrine: or, A Defence of some former REMARKS on a Piece entitled *A* PLEA *for* INFANTS—Baptism: And an ANSWER to a late Pamphlet, call'd, *A farther* DEFENCE—Wherein the Author's Self-contradiction, Fallacy, and Inconclusiveness, is made manifest; together with the Weakness of his Argument for Infant-Baptism; and in particular, that from the Miracles of Christ.—The Commission of Christ the Authority for Christian Baptism,—Infants excluded, by Order of the Commission,—Adult Baptizers Sense of *Rom.* vi. 3, 4. *Col.* ii. 12. still *tenable* by them. To which is added, some farther Remarks on the *Plea.*—And on the *Defence* thereof; and in particular, on the Author's Argument for Infants being the proper Subjects of Baptism, on account of Christ's washing his Disciples Feet; they being ignorant of His Design and Intention therein—With Reflections thereon, and Application thereof, to the Author of the *Plea.*——

V. WATER BAPTISM an Ordinance of the Gospel-Church, manifested, by the Doctrine and Practice of the inspired Apostles. In a SERMON, preached on the Words of our Lord, *Luke* xxiv. 49. Now published, and humbly offer'd, to the serious Consideration of the *Religious People*, call'd QUAKERS. To which is added, an Occasional PREFACE to the READER.

VI. An OCCASIONAL LETTER, offer'd to the serious Consideration of the People call'd QUAKERS, and in particular to Mr. JOSEPH BESSE, who calls himself One of them.

Primitive Christianity PROPOUNDED:

OR, AN

ESSAY

To REVIVE the

Antient MODE or MANNER

OF

PREACHING the GOSPEL.

Humbly offered to the Consideration of all professed Christians; but more especially to the People called BAPTISTS.

Prove all Things: Hold fast that which is good. 1 Thess. v. 21.

So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the Law of Liberty. James ii. 12.

By D. DOBEL, at *Cranbrook* in *Kent.*

LONDON:

Printed for JOSEPH EDWARDS, and sold by him at *Chipstead*, and by J. WAUGH and W. FENNER in *Lombard-Street*; S. CROUDER and H. WOODGATE in *Pater-noster-Row*; Messieurs WILLIAM and JOHN FLACTON Bookfellers in *Canterbury*; WILLIAM MERCER at *Maidstone*; JACOB DOBEL at *Headcorn*; and by the Author at *Cranbrook*. 1755.

CHRISTIAN READER,

IT appears very ſtrange to me, that amongſt the many Books which daily come from the Preſs, very few, if any, has appeared in Favour of the *primitive Mode of preaching the Goſpel*; when with reſpect to other Parts of Chriſtianity, there hath not wanted Advocates to ſtand up for the *primitive Practice*, and to detect and oppoſe Corruptions of every kind: I ſay it is ſtrange to me, eſpecially when I conſider, that the Ordinance of *preaching* the Goſpel is as *ſolemn*, *weighty*, and *uſeful an Appointment*, as any injoined or authoriſed by our Lord; and therefore I think ought as ſtrictly, and as religiouſly to be obſerved, as any other Inſtitution of His.

I have indeed lately ſeen a *Piece*, intituled, *Reading no preaching*; wherein the Author hath done conſiderable Service in detecting the *modern Innovation*; but then it appears to me, that he miſtakes the true *Goſpel Scheme* of *preaching the Word*; foraſmuch as he ſaith, " A Perſon who " cannot regularly, judiciouſly, and piouſly

" ſpeak for Half an Hour, ought never, in my " Opinion, to preach."——But herein I muſt take the Liberty to differ from him, and do conclude, that a Perſon who can thus ſpeak for a quarter of an Hour, may, and ought ſo to do, that ſo he may *fulfil the Miniſtry which he hath received in the Lord.* And this Procedure is agreeable to the different Degree of Abilities beſtowed on different Perſons, and alſo to the *Sermons* recorded in *Holy Writ.*

There are likewiſe others, who give ſome ſhort Hints with reſpect to their Sentiments in this Caſe; but what may be the Cauſe that they only do ſo, I can't well account for, except it be, that they fear Chriſtians will not bear to be told plainly; or if they ſhould do ſo, they might then perhaps condemn their own Practice. However, be that as it will, I have, in the following Pages, been open and free; and as it is become a ſerious Point with me, I deſire the Reader to peruſe it with Care and Attention, joined with *Charity*, and if it ſhould appear to him that I am in an Error, I deſire that the ſame may, in a *friendly Manner*, be communicated to me; for I have no deſire to be *ſingular* for the ſake of *Singularity*, but ſhould much rather it were otherwiſe, and that I could concur with the many, provided it was in a Cauſe that is juſtifiable.

D. D.

Primitive Chriſtianity

PROPOUNDED, &c.

THAT *preaching* the Goſpel is an Ordinance of Chriſt, I preſume no Chriſtian will deny; and I think that a right Adminiſtration thereof ought as ſtrictly to be regarded as any other Appointment of his: For as Preaching is the ordinary Way appointed by God for the Propagation of the Goſpel, the Conviction of Sinners, and the Eſtabliſhment of Saints, I think we may, and ought to conclude, that *Preaching* is the moſt ſuitable and *proper* Method to anſwer thoſe great and important Ends; and therefore I ſay, a ſtrict Regard to the Original *Plan*, or Manner of Performance of this Duty, ought as ſtrictly as poſſible to be adhered to, as any other Ordinance of our Lord. Therefore to alter, or change the Manner of Adminiſtration of this Service, from the *primitive Mode*, is, ſo far as the Alteration extends, a ſetting up the Inventions of Men inſtead of the Goſpel

Gospel of Christ, which no Plea or Pretence whatsoever can justify; for what can justify the introducing a modern Invention of administring a sacred and divine Ordinance?

And in this Case I think every *Minister*, nay, every *Christian*, ought to be very far from countenancing such a Procedure; on the contrary, his Duty to God, and his Allegiance to Christ, should oblige him to bear a faithful Testimony against any Innovations in this Point, as well as against any Corruptions in another; and if we are not uniform, how can we argue with any professed Christians for a right and due Manner of administring any other Ordinance, while we ourselves are corrupt in this? For I believe, as *Mr. G. Killingworth* saith, that "Nothing "done as an Act of Religion can be acceptable to "God, but what is done according to his Appoint-"ment;" *Supplement* P. 19. which, if true, as I think it is, shews the great Importance and Regard that Christians should have to a due and right *Manner* of administring the Word.

Having thus laid before you somewhat of the Importance of the Ordinance of *Preaching*, and of being uniform and consistent Christians, I will go on and shew wherein it appears that *Reading* is not *Preaching*, both according to the *Nature* of Things, and from the *Old* and *New Testament*, and therefore, consequently, is nothing less than an Invention of Men, and, as such, is an Innovation and Corruption of that *sacred* and divine Ordinance of Christ.

And first as to *Reading*, *Wilson*, in his Christian *Dictionary*, tells us, that to *read*, is "to recite di-"stinctly the Syllables and Words of Scripture." Again, "*Reading* is *nothing* else but such a Recital "and speaking forth the *Letters* and *Syllables*."

And

And *Dyche* says, to *read* is " to express in proper " Words *any Thing*, Matter, or Discourse that is " *written*, engraved, or printed :" And farther, that " a *Reader* is any one that *reads* either his OWN or " another's Works."——And agreeable to this we are told, that *Moses took the Book of the Covenant, and* read *in the Audience of all the People*, not *preached* to all the People; no. And again, *Neh.* viii. 8. *So they read in the Book of the Law of God distinctly, and gave the Sense, and caused them to understand the Reading.* From hence it is evident, that Reading is here distinguished from giving the Sense, or *Preaching*; for it was the written *Law* that was read, but the Sense thereof they gave according to their Abilities, endeavouring thereby to make the People *understand the Meaning.* Again, *Luke* iv. 16,——21. it is said that our Lord *went into the Synagogue on the Sabbath Day, and stood up for to read; and there was delivered unto him the Book of the Prophet Esaias, and he* read *therein*, as ver. 18, 19. but ver. 21, 22. we are told that *he began to say unto them, This Day is this Scripture fulfilled in your Ears. And all bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious Words which proceeded out of his Mouth.* Here likewise *Reading* and *Preaching* is mentioned as two distinct Exercises: In the first our Lord expressed the written Words of the Prophet; but *the gracious Words which proceeded out of his Mouth*, was the unwritten Sense, or Application of the *Prophet's* Doctrine to the People: So that from hence it is evident, as one observes, that *Reading* and *Preaching* are two different Exercises; " for *Reading* (says he) is performed by *Importation* of a Flux of Images in the " Mind, by the——Use of the *Eyes on Characters*, whereby certain Ideas are conceived or " formed there, and expressed by the Tongue."

And

And againſt this I ſuppoſe none will object, but allow, that *Reading* proceeds from the Senſes being immediately exerciſed on ſome outward or external Things, which Things are the Source of that immediate Exerciſe: And this I think is plain to every one, both from the Nature of Things, and from the conſtant Uſe of the Word, in the Old and New Teſtament, that it would be trifling farther to enlarge on this Head; ſo that for a Perſon to *read* what HIMSELF or another hath *wrote*, is therein *not* a *Preacher*, but *a Reader*.

But then, ſecondly, to *preach*, or *Preaching*, when uſed with reſpect to the Miniſtration of the Goſpel, are ſynonymous, or one with *teaching*, *ſpeaking and prophecying*, as 1 *Cor.* xiv. 3, *&c.* and theſe, and the like Expreſſions in *Holy Writ*, convey a quite different Idea from *Reading*; for when the former *Terms* are literally uſed in Scripture, they are never to be underſtood to intend *Reading*, but always ſignify a different *Mode* or *Manner* of delivering the Will of God: And this is plain from the Nature of the Exerciſe itſelf; for *Preaching*, in the *New Teſtament* Senſe, is always to be underſtood a Perſon uttering Words according to his Ability, or as his Judgment regulates the Matter in his Mind which he is delivering, agreeable as our Lord ſaith, *Out of the Abundance of the Heart the Mouth ſpeaketh*, *Mat.* xii. 34. And this Way of *ſpeaking* or *preaching* to Perſons from *the Abundance of the Heart*, or Store of the Mind, according to the Occaſion, and preſent Frame of the Soul, is the *natural Mode*, or WAY of Addreſs to Mankind, which God hath implanted in our very Make and Conſtitution, when *Reading* is but an *improper*, or *artificial* one. And agreeable to the former, we find our Lord commanded his Diſciples to *preach the Goſpel to every Creature*,

Creature, or to *teach all Nations*; and accordingly they went on, beginning at *Jeruſalem:* Thus *St. Peter* preached on the Day of *Pentecoſt*, as *Acts* ii. and likewiſe *Philip*, *we are told*, *went down to the City of Samaria*, *and preached Chriſt unto them*, *Acts* viii. 5. which is explained Verſe the 12th, by *Philip's preaching the Things concerning the Kingdom of God*, *and the Name of Jeſus Chriſt*, as he did to the *Eunuch*, when he *opened his Mouth*, *and——preached to him Jeſus:* And in like manner did the Apoſtle *Paul*, *Acts* xvii. 2, 3. And herein they followed the Example of their Lord, of whom it is ſaid, *that he went throughout every City and Village*, *preaching and ſhewing the glad Tidings of the Kingdom of God*, *Luke* viii. 1. I ſay herein they followed their Maſter; but ſure none will ſuppoſe that either of them pulled *Notes* out of their Pockets, and *read* to the People, but rather that they *preached Chriſt and his Kingdom*, according to their *Abilities* and *Gifts* received, which Gifts received were for the Work of the *Miniſtry*, and for the *edifying of the Body of Chriſt*; and being thus qualified and furniſhed of God, it was their incumbent Duty *to take heed thereto*, that they did *fulfil the Miniſtry which they had received in the Lord*, *even as good Stewards of the manifold Grace of God.*

Again, *Preaching*, *&c.* is a publiſhing, by intelligible Words, thoſe *religious Sentiments*, or *Ideas*, which, agreeable to the Occaſion, does ariſe in the Mind, by the Exerciſe of the Faculties of the Soul, and the *Gift* of God, and are ranged in Order, or regulated by the Judgment of him that *ſpeaketh*; ſo that as a certain Author ſaith, *Preaching is done* "*by Exportation of a Train of Ideas*, *picked up by the* "*Judgment immediately from the whole Soul.*" Which *Ideas* do not ariſe from a View of Characters; but flow from an internal Cauſe, as the

Spring or Source of that immediate Exercise: And hence it is evident that *Reading* and *Preaching* are two different Kind of Exercises, and do also convey two distinct Ideas, proceeding from two different Causes, *viz.* one *external*, the other *internal*; which may also be somewhat farther illustrated, by viewing in our Minds the different Employment that there is in *inditing and writing a Letter*, to what there is in *transcribing only*.

And here I will give a Place to the Words of *Tho. Grantham*, when he says, " He then that studies to— " *Preach rightly* doth labour only to have a due un- " derstanding of the Will of God, and of the Nature " of *that* Service; to have a gracious Sense *thereof* " upon his *Heart*; to express faithfully the—Mind " of God to the People; to suit the Matter—to the " People's Capacity in Language and Order most fit " for Edification, and to *leave the Enlargement* in the " Duty to the immediate Assistance of God's Spi- " rit, which is given to his Ministers to *help their* " *Infirmities*; and they have also the Holy Scrip- " tures, which doth *furnish them thoroughly* to every " good Work," Book II. P. 80. And again, in the same Page, he declares, That, " to compose " *Sermons in writing*, and so *read* them to the " People, is *not Preaching*, and therefore not to be " used by the Minister of Christ under the Notion " of *that* Service." And herein our *worthy Friend* hath fully expressed my Sentiment in this Point; all which appears to me to be agreeable to the *New Testament*, and the Practice of the *primitive Church*, and also to *Dyche*, in his *English* Dictionary, who says, " A *Reader* is any one who *reads* either his own, " or another's Works:" And to *Wilson*, who likewise tells us, Reading is IMPROPERLY called Preaching; and therefore to pretend and argue that *Reading* is *Preaching*

Preaching in the proper and Goſpel Senſe, is to endeavour to blend and confound together as one, what God in his *Word* and *Nature* hath made two; and as *Reading* is not *Preaching*, and as Preaching is an Ordinance of God, to ſubſtitute *Reading* in the Room or Stead of *Preaching* is manifeſtly to change or make void God's own Ordinance, and to eſtabliſh and ſet up the *Cuſtom* and *Tradition* of Men in its ſtead, which all profeſſed *Miniſters* of the Goſpel would do well to conſider: For ſhould they be asked another Day, by what Authority, or on what Account they did theſe Things, can it be ſuppoſed it would be ſufficient to plead Cuſtom, and the *pleaſing of a polite Age?* no certainly, that will not excuſe; for to ſuppoſe this, or the like will do, is to argue, that the *Appointments of Chriſt* may be altered and diſpenſed with to pleaſe the *Humours* of Men, and if this be once admitted, we may ſoon bid adieu to revealed Religion, or Chriſtianity itſelf.

And farther, as Preaching is an Ordinance of God, it is but reaſonable to conclude that he will afford ſufficient Means to furniſh ſuch as he ſhall ſee meet to employ in that Work; for to ſuppoſe otherwiſe would reflect on the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God: And though Perſons may not in this Age of Chriſtianity have ſo large a Gift in ſome reſpects for the Work of the *Miniſtry*, as the Apoſtles had, yet I think we may ſafely conclude, that as the Work of the *Miniſtry* is to continue, as well as other Ordinances, as *Mat.* xxviii. 19, 20. Almighty God, who is the ſame yeſterday, to-day, and forever, will not fail of his Promiſe made to the Church by his Son, of being with them *to the End of the World*, or for ever, *John* xiv. 16. even of *giving Gifts to Men*, for the *perfecting of the Saints*, and alſo *for the*

Work of the Miniſtry; and therefore if theſe Gifts are not ſo viſible as we could wiſh for or expect, I conclude that the Cauſe is not in God, but in profeſſed Chriſtians, in that there is not in them that earneſt Deſire and *waiting on God* for them, as there ought to be, agreeable to *Mat.* ix. 28. neither doth there appear ſuch a ſuitable Diſpoſition of Mind in the *Miniſters* nor *People* to depend and reſt ſatisfied on the Gift God is pleaſed to beſtow; but there ſeems rather to be a kind of Diſtruſt and Diſlike; Diſtruſt in the Miniſters, as though the *Gift of God* was not *ſufficient*; and Diſlike in private Chriſtians, that they are not ſatisfied with the plain, ſimple preaching the Goſpel, but look more at what is called Order, *fine Language*, *Method* and *Style*, than at the plain Goſpel-*Method of adminiſtring the Word*, in whom the Prophecy of the Apoſtle in part is fulfilled, when he ſays, *the Time will come when they—— will heap to themſelves Teachers, having itching Ears*, and theſe, ſaid *St. Paul*, *ſhall turn away their Ears from the Truth*,——which likewiſe in ſome Meaſure is come to paſs in our Days, in that Error called *Catholick Communion*, which of late hath been publickly pleaded for, and that by an eminent *reading Preacher* (if that can poſſibly be) who argues for *univerſal Communion* of all profeſſed Chriſtians, whether truly baptized or not, tho' he allows none were admitted to *Communion in the primitive Church*, but ſuch as had been regularly baptized: And indeed I do not ſee what ſhould hinder him, and ſuch as he, from receiving a written form of Prayer, nay of not embracing the greateſt Part of the eſtabliſhed *Liturgy*;——for the ſame Argument in kind, that is made uſe of to juſtify one, is equally ſufficient to juſtify the other; for there is no Precept nor Precedent for either, (ſave our *Lord's Prayer*) in all the New

New Teſtament, and therefore as there is no divine Warrant for it, it ſtands entirely on human Approbation, and becomes feaſible by Cuſtom: And by the ſame Authority we may gradually introduce many errors of the Church of *Rome*; for what ſhould hinder when we are not for ſticking cloſe to the Rule of *God's Word*, but do in ſome Things take the Liberty to deviate therefrom; I ſay, what ſhould hinder us from giving into many other Corruptions, whenever they attain amongſt Men the Name of good Order, honourable, *&c.* or that may be approved and agreeable to the Taſte of the *polite*, and the unthinking Part of Mankind.

Again, as it was by the Gifts of *Nature*, and of *Grace*, that Perſons were qualified for preaching in the *primitive Time*, ſo I humbly conceive it ought ſtill to be carried on according to the *Abilities* God doth give, in the Uſe of the outward Means of his Grace afforded, *viz.* the Scriptures of the Prophets, and the New Teſtament, which by Miniſters is to be *read*, and carefully *meditated* and *ſtudied*, that ſo they may, by the Gifts received, have the Doctrine of Chriſt *dwell richly in them*, and thereby be able, as Occaſion may require, to *preach* the Word both to the Church and World, building up the Believers in the Faith, and enlightening dark Minds, to the Glory of God, and the good of Souls. And as one obſerves, *This Gift is ſometimes conferred on ſuch who otherwiſe, than in the miniſtring of the Word, have no Capacity more than others; nay, come far ſhort in their Abilities in other Reſpects than many of their Brethren, who, notwithſtanding their ſuperior Abilities, have not that publick Spirit, Enlargedneſs of Heart, and Utterance, which is neceſſary for a Miniſter of the Goſpel.*

And

And I may alſo farther add, that it hath ſometimes pleaſed God in his Wiſdom and Goodneſs to qualify poor labouring Men, and ſuch who were, and ſome who are deſtitute of human Learning, to be very uſeful in the miniſterial Employment; ſo that according to *St. Paul*, God therein manifeſted his Wiſdom and Power; and agreeable to the Prophet, that *Out of the Mouths of Babes and Sucklings God ordaineth Strength.* From all which I conclude, agreeable as before obſerved, that Miniſters ſhould preach according to their *Gifts* and Ability received; and in order uſefully ſo to do, it is meet that they apply themſelves, in the Exerciſe of their *Gift, to the Study of the Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles*; endeavouring and praying that they may have a due underſtanding of the Will of God therein, and may be capable to expreſs the ſame according to the Enlargement of their Hearts in the Time of Action, as may be to the *Inſtruction*, *Edification*, *Exhortation*, and *Comfort* of them that attend their Miniſtrations. And this agrees with *Biſhop Burnet*, who ſays, " If a Man can carry on this Method, " and by much Meditation and Prayer draw down " divine Influences, *which are always to be expected*, " when a Man puts himſelf in the WAY of them, " and prepares himſelf for them, he will *always* " *feel* that while he is *muſing*, *a Fire is kindled* within " him, and then he will ſpeak with Authority, and " without Conſtraint; his Thoughts will be true, " and his Expreſſions free and eaſy." See *Paſtoral Care*, P. 112.

And this agrees with the Words of an eminent Author, when ſpeaking of the miniſterial Work, ſays, that " there is certainly a far " greater Grace and Efficacy in Sermons, when " expreſſed as of the Ability which God giveth, " than when they are *ſaid* or *read* only; and

" the

" the chief Reaſon *(ſays he)* is becauſe one is " God's Ordinance, the other but Man's Tradi- " tion ;" and I may add, is but of a late Invention, it not being known to the *primitive Church:* Nay, ſaith an Author, " there is no Denomination of " *Clergy*, *Greek* or *Latin*, *Papiſt* or *Proteſtant*, in " any Nation (*England* excepted) that gives into " this unprecedented Method of reading their Diſ- " courſes to the People for Preaching." And is it not very ſtrange that we, who profeſs to make the Scriptures our Rule, not only of Faith, but alſo of Practice, ſhould in this Caſe run ſo counter to them? and ſhall we, who as a People declare, when arguing againſt *Infant Sprinkling*, that nothing is to be allowed in the Worſhip and Service of God but what we have a divine Warrant for, I ſay, ſhall we who thus declare, in this ſolemn and important Service of God, depart from this Rule, and the Practice of the primitive Church, and give into, nay, plead for the *late Tradition of Men!* Are we in this conſiſtent with ourſelves? With what Face can we argue againſt Infant-Baptiſm, ſo called, while we ourſelves are ſetting aſide, or changing another Ordinance of Chriſt contained in his Commiſſion? Can we ever hope or expect that our Argument, grounded on the New Teſtament, for *Believer's Baptiſm by dipping*, will be of any Force to them while we in another important Point, are departing from the Goſpel *Mode*.

And I cannot conceive how Perſons in our Days can ſatisfy themſelves with *Reading* inſtead of *Preaching*, when it is without any divine Authority; for the New Teſtament no where mentions it, nor alludes to any ſuch Practice; and the Practice of the *Apoſtles* and *primitive Church*, in executing this Part of the *Commiſſion*, ſhews how they underſtood it, not by *Reading*

Reading, but by *Preaching*, and that according to the *Gift of God*, and the Ability received. And I think we that profeſs to ſtick cloſe to the Rule of God's Word, ſhould not make any Alterations in the Conſtitution and Settlement of Chriſt's Kingdom, nor in any one Caſe invade his royal Prerogative, in ſetting up our own Inventions in Oppoſition to his Precepts; for this of *Reading* inſtead of *Preaching* is as great an Alteration as can well be made in the practical Part of this Ordinance. And, ſays *Tho. Grantham*, "To ſtudy either *Prayer* or *Sermon*, and to compoſe them in writing, and ſo read them to the People, is neither *Prayer* nor *Preaching*, and therefore not to be uſed by the *Miniſters* of Chriſt, under the Notion of theſe Services."—And I find a learned Author, agreeable to this, ſaith, "It hath often fallen out that God having regarded the Simplicity of the Preacher hath fallen in upon his Heart by the Aſſiſtance of his Spirit, and thereby hath led him to ſpeak things which he had not premeditated, and what ſometimes perhaps he never had thought of before, and (ſays he) theſe unpremeditated, tho' lively Exhortations, have proved more beneficial, both to himſelf and his Hearers, than all his premeditated Diſcourſe." But tho' I give this a Place here, I would not have any ſuppoſe that I am againſt *Meditation* and *Study*; for I believe it is a *Miniſter's* Duty ſo to do, according to *Paul*, 2 *Timothy*, ii. 15. yet I believe the Preacher lays himſelf much more in the Way to receive Aſſiſtance from God, in his *Preaching*, than the *Reader:* For, as a certain Author obſerves, with reſpect to the reading Method, that *it is in fact to ſay, Lord hitherto ſhalt thou come, and no farther; here ſhall thy Directions be ſtayed*; but this is to be underſtood of ſuch only as write all

all they deliver; for it is certain that thoſe who write only the Heads of what they would offer, and leave the Enlargement thereon to the Time of Action, do lay themſelves ſomewhat open to that Aſſiſtance which, as a Miniſter of Chriſt, he hath Reaſon to hope for and expect, though that Method is without any Scripture *Precept* or *Precedent*.

And *George Hammond*, who in his Days was a Perſon of note amongſt the Churches, ſpeaking of the *true Miniſtry*, ſays, " They are not only ſent " by Jeſus Chriſt to preach, but alſo *gifted* by him, " whereby they are enabled to preach at all times, " *inſtant in Seaſon, and out of Seaſon*, —— and receive " not their *Miniſtry of Man*, or *from Man*,——but " receive it as a free Gift," *Eph.* iii. 8. And again, " God (ſays he) gives gifts to Men of the leaſt ac- " count, that perſons may not aſcribe Praiſe to " the Creature, as to his Wiſdom or Learning, " or ſuch like Things, but may attribute Praiſe " only to God the Creator; for the leſs fleſhly " Parts, or human Wiſdom, is ſeen in the Crea- " ture, the more the *Gift of God* is magnified."

Likewiſe *Dr. Watts*, who, though he allowed the uſe of Notes, yet was intirely againſt Miniſters confining themſelves thereto; and to this Purpoſe he ſpeaks excellently well in his *Humble Attempt*, Pages 75, 76, 77. " Speak (ſays he) to your " Hearers with Freedom; not as if you were read- " ing or repeating your Leſſon to them, but as a " Man ſent to teach and perſuade them to Faith " and Holineſs. Deliver your Diſcourſes to the " People like a Man that is talking to them in good " earneſt about their moſt important Concerns, " ——like a Meſſenger ſent from Heaven, who " would fain ſave Sinners from Hell, and allure " Souls to God and Happineſs. Do not indulge

 that

" that lazy Way of Reading,——as a School-Boy " does an Oration out of *Livy* or *Cicero*." And again, " do not impoſe upon yourſelves juſt ſuch " a Number of precompoſed Words and Lines to " be delivered in an Hour, without daring to ſpeak " a warm Sentiment that comes freſh upon the " Mind. Why may we not hope for ſome lively " Turns of Thought, ſome new pious Sentiments " which may ſtrike Light and Heat ?——In the " Zeal of your Miniſtrations, why may you not " expect ſome bright, and warm, and pathetick " Forms of Argument and Perſuaſion to offer " themſelves to your Lips?——Have you not often " found ſuch an enlargement of Thought, ſuch " a Variety of Sentiment, and Freedom of Speech, " in common Converſation, upon an important " Subject, beyond what you were appriſed of be- " fore hand ? And why ſhould you forbid yourſelf " this natural Advantage in the Pulpit, and in the " Fervour of ſacred Miniſtrations, where alſo you " have more Reaſon to hope for divine Aſſiſt- " ance ?

" Beſides, for us who are Proteſtant Diſſenters, " and confine ourſelves to no ſet Forms of *Prayer*, " it ſeems more unreaſonable to confine our Lips " conſtantly——to the Words written in our Pa- " pers in the work of Preaching. Do we plead ſo " earneſtly for the Liberty of Prayer, and yet ne- " ver give our Spirits a Liberty to expreſs their " warm, lively, and affectionate Thoughts, in " miniſtring the Goſpel of Chriſt under the Hopes " of his Aſſiſtance ?——As there has been many a " fervent and devout Petition offered to God in " our Addreſſes to him, which has not been thought " of before, ſo many a Sentence that was never " written has been delivered in our Addreſſes to

" the

" the People with glorious Succeſs; it has come " *more immediately and warm from the Heart*, and " may have been bleſſed of God to ſave a Soul." And this is agreeable to the Words of the *Marquis* of *Halifax*, as cited by this Author, Page 161, 162. where he likens *Reading-Preachers* to *Statues, or Men of Straw in the Pulpit*:——But this I chuſe to paſs over, and do conclude with *Dr. Watts*, that there is as much reaſon to write our *Prayers* as our *Sermons*: For, agreeable to the Wiſe Man's Caution, we ſhould not *be raſh with our Mouth, nor haſty with our Lips to utter any thing before*, or to *God*; but for Miniſters to ſhew greater Care how they expreſs themſelves to Men, than to their Maker, I think is paying that Deference to their Fellow-Creature which is due to God the Creator: And againſt this of writing, and reading Sermons, inſtead of *preaching* them, I ſhall here give a Place to the Words of *Franciſcus Lambertus*, in his Tract 5th of Prophecy, Chap. iii. who ſays, " Where are they " now, that glory in their Inventions, who ſay, " a brave Invention! This they call Invention " which themſelves have made up, but what have " the *Faithful* to do with ſuch Inventions? Beware " (ſaith he) that thou determine not preciſely to " ſpeak what before thou haſt meditated;——for " though it *may* be lawful to determine the Text, " which thou *wouldeſt* expound, yet not the [*preciſe*] Interpretation, leſt, if thou ſo doſt, thou " take from the Holy Spirit that which is his, to-" wit, to direct thy ſpeach,——but above *all things* " be careful thou follow not the Manner of Hypo-" crites, who have written almoſt Word by Word " what they are to ſay, as if they were to repeat " ſome Verſes upon a Theatre,——and afterwards " pray the Lord to *direct their Tongue*; and yet at

" the ſame time are determined to ſay nothing but " what they have written." He goes on, ſaying, " O unhappy kind of Prophets, which depend not " upon God, but upon their own Writings." And, whatever may be thought of the above, the Practice of many *Miniſters* in our Days is too much like it; and it would be more agreeable for them, in their Prayer before Sermon, to pray that God would continue to them their *Health*, *Eye-ſight*, and the Uſe of their *Tongue*; then to pray that God would give them a *Word*; that he would direct their *Hearts*, and enable them to ſpeak the *Truth as it is in Jeſus*, or as the *Oracles* of God ſpeaketh, *&c.* I ſay, the former would be more agreeable for a *Reading Preacher*, though ſomething like the latter is often the caſe, which appears to me nothing leſs than great Impertinence to the Almighty, and is near a-kin to *Mockery*.

But why do I cite Authors againſt this *Reading Method*, Since the New Teſtament is wholly ſilent on this Head; for I do conclude with *Dr. Hughes*, in his Sermon againſt Popery, Page 37. " That " nothing muſt be allowed in God's Worſhip, but " what we have his Warrant for; and again, that " the very Silence of the Scripture is enough to " condemn it:" And with *Dr. Gale*, " That it is " not an indifferent Matter whether we obey God " and Chriſt or not, and perform divine Service " according to his Will and Appointment." And in Vol. II. Page 155, " Aſſure (ſays he) yourſelves " it is not an indifferent and trifling Matter, whe- " ther, AND HOW we perform the ſeveral Parts of " our Duty: He has given us a plain Rule, and " expects we ſhould yield an undiſputed and unli- " mited Obedience to all his Commands, and all " the ſeveral Particulars, and EACH CIRCUM-

" STANCE

" STANCE therein expreſſed or included.——And " if we do any thing which is not commanded, that " can have no more Force or value than our own " Power and Authority can give it; and ſo indeed " it may greatly *pleaſe ourſelves*, while it is highly " diſpleaſing, and an Abomination to the Lord." All this, and much more of the ſame Nature, may very well be applied to the Caſe in hand; and as this Practice of Reading is intirely unſcriptural, how can any *Proteſtant Chriſtian* openly countenance it, and give publick Sanction to the Performance thereof, when his own Conſcience muſt, I think, if he will but conſider, aſſure him that it is no other than a mere *human Device*, whereby that of Chriſt's Appointment is ſubverted?

And do we not as a *People* refuſe to *kneel* at the Communion, and that becauſe we do not find any ſuch *Poſture* practiſed by Chriſt nor his Apoſtles; but that they *ſat* at the *Lord's Supper*; and hence we conclude *ſitting* to be the proper *Poſture* for that Service, and alſo the only one that can be juſtified from the New Teſtament, and therefore on this Account we obſerve it, or practiſe accordingly; and for Perſons to tell us, that the Poſture of *Kneeling is but a Circumſtance*, I am apt to think is ſuch an Argument that would weigh but very little with us, and that becauſe we profeſs to pay a ſtrict Regard to the *Precedents* of the *New Teſtament*; and this is agreeable to *Dr. Gale*, as before, with reſpect to any Ordinance of Chriſt, that we *ought to yield an undiſputed Obedience to each Circumſtance therein expreſſed or included.* And now, let us apply this to the Caſe in hand, and I doubt not but it will ſoon appear, that the ſubſtituting *Reading* in the room and ſtead of *Preaching*, is ſuch a *Circumſtance* which makes as great, if not a greater Alteration

in

in the Ordinance of *Preaching*, as that of *kneeling* inſtead of *ſitting* at the Holy Communion; and, if ſo, then, if we would be conſiſtent with ourſelves, we ought to avoid one, as well as the other.

And again, when we are arguing againſt *mixed Communion*, do we not argue from the Silence of the New Teſtament, that is to ſay, becauſe there is no *Precept* nor *Precedent* therein to ground ſuch a Practice upon; and alſo becauſe all the Inſtances therein of Perſons communicating are of ſuch who previouſly had been *baptized*; and therefore as it is an unſcriptural Practice we juſtly conclude, and treat it as an Innovation on Chriſtianity. And juſt the ſame is the Caſe before us, the *New Teſtament* is intirely ſilent concerning any ſuch Practice, and all the Inſtances therein of adminiſtring the Word is by *Preaching*, and therefore to introduce *Reading* inſtead of *Preaching*, is to innovate or corrupt that Part of the *Commiſſion* of our Lord, and this hath a Tendency to leſſen the whole Authority of the Doctrine of Chriſt; for agreeable to *Mr. Killingworth*, ſo I believe, that "not any one Part "of Chriſtianity, as the Religion of Chriſt Je- "ſus, can be at all binding upon us, whilſt ſome "other Parts of it, depending upon the ſame "Authority, are not ſo." And again, "That a "Compliance with the Prejudices of others muſt "of neceſſity create Indifferency to Chriſt, and the "whole of his Inſtitution:" And therefore as this is of ſuch evil Tendency, and doth open a Door to the Enemies of Chriſt, and his Cauſe, let us ſee the Importance of remaining inflexible, and of watching the Approaches of Innovation, and that of every Kind; and as occaſion may require, *contend earneſtly* for the *Faith*, in every Part thereof, *which was once delivered to the Saints*.

But

But perhaps againſt this *Method of Preaching* that I have been arguing for, it may be ſaid, that it is nothing elſe but *Enthuſiaſm*, *&c.* To which I ſay, that I find this Term *Enthuſiaſm* is very differently underſtood, ſometimes in a good Senſe, and at other times in a bad one; in a good Senſe, when it is ſpoken of the Prophets and Servants of God, being *inſpired, or moved by the Holy Ghoſt*, or ſo filled with the Spirit of God, as to ſpeak in a prophetick Strain: As *Bailey* in his Dictionary ſays, "It is an "Inſpiration, whether real or imaginary:" And *Whitefield*, in his Sermon on *John* vii. 37, 38. Page 9th, ſays, "Every Chriſtian, in the proper Senſe "of the Word, muſt be an *Enthuſiaſt*; that is, "muſt be inſpired of God."——I ſuppoſe he means that he muſt have the *Spirit of God* in him; and if this Senſe of the Word be admitted, then I do readily allow that ſome degree of *Enthuſiaſm* is neceſſary for a Miniſter of the Goſpel. See alſo Characteriſticks, Vol. I. Page 53. Vol III. Miſcel. 2. Chap. 1.

But I obſerve, that the Term, *Enthuſiaſm*, in common, is applied to Perſons who ſtrongly fancy to have divine Revelations, and thereby propagate ſome monſtrous and abſurd Notions in Religion, proſecuting their *Fancies* in a wild *unreaſonable* Way and Manner, that is inconſiſtent to *Nature* and divine Revelation; and this is agreeable to *Dyche* in his Dictionary.

Now if *Enthuſiaſm* is to be taken in this laſt Senſe, then I anſwer, firſt, that for a Man whoſe Mind is by *Meditation and Study*, well ſtored with *the Chriſtian Doctrine*, and ſuited by the *Gifts* of Nature and of Grace, agreeable as before expreſſed; I ſay, for ſuch a one uſefully to adminiſter the Word without *reading* it, is not inconſiſtent to *Reaſon*; but it is rather

rather agreeable to it, or it is but reaſonable to expect, that ſuch a Perſon will be capable ſo to do! And hence it is plain, that my Scheme is not tainted with this unreaſonable Senſe, or a Part of *Enthuſiaſm.*

And *ſecondly*, As it is by Meditation and Study on the Chriſtian Revelation, joined with ſincere *Prayer*, that a Miniſter's Mind becomes well furniſhed for *preaching* the Goſpel, and according to the Ability received, he is concerned to deliver the ſame, agreeable to the beſt of his Judgment and Underſtanding, and this by *preaching* according to the Practice of the *primitive Church:* And as a Miniſter pays ſuch Regard to the *Chriſtian Revelation*, and truly adminiſters the Word agreeable to the *Mode* or *Manner* therein laid down; I ſay while this is the Caſe, for any to ſtigmatize his *Preaching* with this *Enthuſiaſm*, is not only very groundleſs, but alſo unjuſt: Nay, if any of the two deſerve to be called *Enthuſiaſm*, according to the latter Senſe, then I think it is the *reading* Method; for *Preaching* is certainly the moſt *natural* Way of addreſs to Mankind, and therefore moſt conſiſtant to *Reaſon*, and is alſo moſt agreeable to the Scriptures: So that if either be *Enthuſiaſm*, or a *groundleſs Fancy*, it is the *Reading-Method*, and that becauſe it is moſt *unnatural*, as well as altogether *unſcriptural.*

And farther, I would ask, whether for a *Conſellor*, or a *Lawyer* that is well furniſhed with the Knowledge of the *Law*, and is qualified with natural Gifts to plead in Court; I ſay I would ask whether it is *Enthuſiaſm* in him to plead his *Client's Cauſe* without Notes? Certainly I think none will conclude it is; and therefore why ſhould it be deemed *Enthuſiaſm*, for a *Miniſter* to *preach* to his Auditory the great Concerns and Duties of Religion, who (like

(like the Lawyer) hath made Religion the chief Matter of his *Meditation* and *Study*. Indeed it is very ſtrange and ſurpriſing to me, that *Enthuſiaſm*, as a Term of Reproach, ſhould be thrown out more on *Miniſters* that preach without Notes, than on any other publick Speaker, when they deliver themſelves in the ſame Way and Manner that Miniſters ought to do.

Again, ſome object againſt this *Preaching*-method, becauſe they ſuppoſe it has a Tendency to hinder the *Miniſter's* Improvement, and to make him *idle*, and unconcerned about his publick Miniſtrations, and alſo to cauſe him to ſpeak at random, *&c.*

To which I anſwer, that the contrary to this in general I believe is the Truth*; for when a *Reading*-Miniſter hath taken upon him the work a Year or two, and comes to have a good Stock of Sermons by him, if he is not ſtrongly inclined to *Meditation*, *Study*, and *Compoſing*, *&c.* he will, I am apt to think, find himſelf under ſuch a Temptation to INDOLENCE, that 'tis moſt likely to prevail on him ſo far to content himſelf with his *Store*, as but rarely to give himſelf the Trouble to make a new Sermon; and this I have often heard mentioned as the Caſe of not a few of the *Reading-Preachers*; and if this Suppoſition be true, as I fear too often it is, what great *Improvement* is it likely that ſuch a Miniſter will make in his miniſtrations? And as to the *Preachers* ſpeaking at *random*, by which I underſtand his ſpeaking without any care or Deſign, I ſay as to ſuch a Caſe, it is what I very much diſapprove of, and truſt that there is not many Inſtances of this kind to be found: But ſuppoſe there are a few, that will not in the leaſt juſtify the *Reading-Method*, but only make it plain, that ſuch *Mi-*

niſters are negligent, and take not that *Care and Pains* they ought to do. And here I would ask, whether all thoſe *Readers* Sermons are coherent, and will bear Examination? Nay, whether the Works of many *learned* Perſons on religious Subjects, will bear a ſtrict Scrutiny: Agreeable as a certain Biſhop, when taking notice of Perſons finding fault with ſome Inaccuracy in a Diſcourſe, ſays, "They, "muſt have narrow Souls, who can think ſuch "*little Eſcapes* worth any one's notice; for there "is abundance of theſe to be met with in the beſt "Originals." But farther, ſome do object that what I plead for is *Quakeriſm*, &c.

To which I anſwer, firſt, that I am ready to think ſuch as make uſe of this as an Objection, are not very well acquainted with the *Quakers* Sentiments on this Point: But ſuppoſe they are, and the *Miniſtry* I contend for was wholly like theirs, would it therefore follow that it is to be rejected? Muſt we deny the Being of God, becauſe the *Quakers* believe there is one!

However, though I differ from them in my Sentiment, relating to the Goſpel-Miniſtry, yet I freely own, that the *viſible Mode*, or *Manner* of their publick Miniſtrations are as much, if not more agreeable to the New Teſtament, and Practice of the *primitive Church*, than the Method of many Miniſters, in the ſeveral Denominations of profeſſed Chriſtians amongſt us.

But notwithſtanding this, yet I believe they are under great Miſtakes in their Pretenſions concerning it. However, it is not my Buſineſs now to argue this Point with them, but only to ſhew wherein I differ from them herein: And that there is a real difference, is plain to me from my many Years Acquaintance, and free Converſation which

I had with them; wherein I often obſerved they pleaded for *immediate Revelation from God*; moving them immediately both with reſpect to the *Time* when they are to *pray* or *preach*, and alſo as to the Words of their Exhortations, Prayers, *&c.* and that they did not concern themſelves aforehand, but intirely waited for the *immediate* Motion of the Spirit of God to direct, and wholly to dictate to them in their publick Miniſtrations. And this is the Subſtance of what I have often heard from their Mouths, and in Vindication of this they many times cited the Words of our Lord, *Mat.* x. 20. where he told his Diſciples that *the Spirit in the ſame Hour ſhould teach them what they ſhould ſay*;——but whether this Paſſage be juſtly applicable to Miniſters now in common, as I have frequently heard them apply it, and as *Robert Barclay* does in his *Apol.* P. 261. I ſhall leave to the Conſideration of the Reader.

Secondly, The above is agreeable to their Writings, as *Sam. Fiſher*, in his collected Labours, Page 559. ſpeaking of their Miniſters, ſays, " They are " indeed inſpired by the Holy Spirit, whoſe Meſ- " ſages and Miniſtrations, whether by *Voice* or " *Writing*, are ſo *immediate from the Mouth of the* " *Lord*, that your not receiving nor ſubmitting to " them on that Account, but rejecting—thereof,— " doth juſtify your Predeceſſors in all Ages, who " rejected and ſlew thoſe that ſpake to them in the " Name of the Lord." And *Robert Barclay* in his *Apol.* Prop. 10. ſpeaking of their Miniſtry, ſays, " he is led and ordered in his Labour and Work of " the Goſpel, both as to the *Place where*, as to the " *Perſons to whom*, and as to the *Time wherein* he is " to miniſter." And Page 238, 242. he there ſeems to argue, that Miniſters are not to preach,

unleſs they find an abſolute Neceſſity laid on them ſo to do: Page 246. he pretends Miniſters are to abſtain from all Motions of their own Mind, even from Thoughts materially good, and thus remain unconcerned, as well as in Silence, till God ſpeaks in them. And *R. Claridge*, in his *poſthumous* Works, Page 509. ſpeaking of Prophets or Miniſters, ſays, they *declare the Mind of God received by immediate Revelation.* And agreeable to this I might add much more, but I truſt this may be ſufficient, to ſhew the Sentiments of the *Quakers* with reſpect to the Grounds of their Miniſtrations.

And as I have before intimated, with reſpect to the *Mode* or *Manner* of their *preaching*, that I am near one with them; ſo the Difference is not in this, but in the Way by which they pretend to be furniſhed for the Miniſtration of the Goſpel.

Now from the above, it is plain the *Quakers* conclude, that altho' God hath given to Man *Reaſon* and *Underſtanding*, and alſo the *Word of his Grace*; yet according to them, there is no neceſſity to attend on the external Means of Grace, nor to exerciſe the *rational Faculties*, in order for a Perſon's being qualified, or furniſhed to adminiſter the Word; but that he is to be entirely paſſive in this Caſe, till the Mind of God flows in upon him by *immediate Inſpiration* or *Revelation*; and agreeable to this *Robert Barclay*, when ſpeaking againſt Miniſters exerciſing their own Minds, ſays, "That "he being ſilent, God may ſpeak in him, and the "good Seed may ariſe, or until Words can be "brought forth;" Page 242, 246. So that it appears to me from the whole, that *Reading*, *Meditation* and *Study* are excluded by them, from being neceſſary to qualify Perſons for *preaching* of the Goſpel:

Goſpel: And thus the Difference between me and the *Quakers* is evident; I ſay from hence it is evident, as I argue that *Reading*, *Meditation*, and the *Study* of the Scriptures, joined with ſincere Prayer, is not to be omitted, but attended to; whereas they declare they depend wholly on *immediate Revelation:* So that the difference between them and me in this Point is very great; and therefore I hope all Perſons will be able for the future, to diſtinguiſh my Sentiment from the *Quakers* in this Caſe.

And here perhaps it may be expected I ſhould declare my Mind with reſpect to a Miniſter's ſtudying and compoſing a Sermon in writing, and getting it by Heart, ſo as to be able to deliver it Word for Word.

To which I anſwer, that this Method would be attended with a great deal of Labour and Pains, and when all is done there would be found very few capable to attain it; and the few that were would have ſo much to do, that they would hardly have leiſure to mind any thing elſe: Beſides, it appears to me very little different from *Reading*; becauſe there would be the ſame Confinement to Words, and I can by no means approve of it, ſince it doth not, from any Part of the *New Teſtament*, appear to be God's Way, and it doth render Part of our Prayers before *Sermon* worſe than needleſs, and alſo ſets aſide the Office of the good *Remembrancer* as then uſeleſs; and I do conclude with a learned Author, "That a Preacher who doth not get his "Sermon by Heart is intirely Maſter of himſelf, "ſpeaks in an eaſy unaffected Way, and Things "then flow from their proper Source: His Lan-"guage *(ſays he)* will be lively and moving, and "the Warmth that animates him will lead him to "ſuch Expreſſions and Figures as he *would hardly* "have

" have found out by Study." And again, " Shall " a Minister be so jealous of his Reputation, and fond " of VAIN POMP, as not to dare to speak to his " People without having learnt his Lesson by Heart " like a School-Boy.

And farther it may be inquired, what I think of a Minister's composing aforehand the general Heads of his Sermon.

in his mind

To such an enquiry I say, this may be justifiable, or it may not; justifiable when such composing flows from the free Dictates or Disposition of his Mind, so likewise the same with respect to the Exercise of his Thoughts by Way of Enlargement on those Heads, provided that he do not in any of these, limit and confine himself thereto in the *Time of Action*, but doth give a Place to those Things which may *arise* or *flow* in with Warmth on his Mind in his Ministration, as suitable to the Subject-matter he is upon: And this agrees with *Dr. Watts*, when he says, " A Minister may hope for some fresh, " lively Turns of Thought, some new pious Senti- " ments which may strike Light and Heat in the " Zeal of his Ministrations, may expect some bright, " warm, and pathetick Forms of Argument and " Persuasion, to offer themselves to his Lips " ——beyond what he was apprized of before- " hand." He then goes on, and concludes it to be such an Advantage, which no Minister should deprive himself of, in the Fervour of his sacred Ministrations, where, says he, *they have Reason to hope for divine Assistance.*

And I should be glad to know by what New Testament *Precept* or *Precedent* it is, that we allot the whole *ministerial Service* of a *Meeting* to one Person; though sometimes it may be very proper; but what I mean is, by what Authority it is stated-

ly

ly ſo, or as it is now in common. *Saint Paul* ſays, *Let the Prophets ſpeak two or three, and let the others judge. If any thing be revealed to another that ſitteth by, let the firſt hold his Peace. For ye may all propheſy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted*, 1 *Corinth*, xiv. 29, 30, 31. From hence it is evident, that the ſeveral *Miniſters* in the Church of *Corinth* were to uſe their *Gifts*, ſo as might be for Edification; and in order thereto they might *ſpeak two or three*; that is, one after the other, and if while one was *preaching any thing ſhould be revealed, or ariſe in the Mind of another that ſets by*, he was to wait till he that was ſpeaking had done, and then the other might deliver what he had to ſay, and not only ſo, but ſays the Apoſtle to the *Miniſters*, *Ye may all prophecy one by one, that all may learn, and that all may be comforted.*

And hence it is evident, that the *Miniſters* which did ſpeak in a *known Tongue*, might at one and the ſame Meeting *preach* one after another; Nay, *Saint Paul* ſeems to recommend it, ſaying, *Let the prophets ſpeak two or three*, and again, *Ye may all prophecy one by one*; and thus every *miniſterial Gift beſtowed on the Church* would be improved to the Edification of the whole; and ſo he that had but *one Talent* might, as he ought, *fulfil his Miniſtry* in proportion as he that had received *two* or *five*; and this Procedure appears to be conſiſtent, and agreeable to the Nature of the Caſe itſelf, as well as to the gracious Deſign of God, in beſtowing different Degrees of *miniſterial Gifts* on his Church and People.

But I am entirely at a loſs how this can be duly perfórmed according to the preſent Cuſtom, of one Perſon's taking the whole Opportunity: Beſides, this is either limiting, or ſtraining the Gift beyond its

its due Bounds : For, according to the preſent Method, he that hath but *one Talent* reads as long as he that hath *two* or *five*, and he that hath *five*, according to the preſent Cuſtom, preacheth no longer than he that hath but *one :* But whether this Practice be conſiſtent with the *different Abilities* of Miniſters, I leave to the Conſideration of every ſerious Chriſtian.

And here I would appeal to my Brethren that are *Preachers* of the Goſpel, whether they have not experienced at times a great Difference in themſelves with reſpect to a *Fitneſs* or *Unfitneſs* for the Work; and whether when they find an Unfitneſs to attend on this ſolemn inſtitution, it would not be wiſer to ſit down with a few Words to the Purpoſe, than to endeavour to ſtand the uſual Time? And whether, on Reflection, we can't call to mind, with reſpect to ourſelves, that we have found juſt cauſe to have wiſhed that the preſent Cuſtom had not obtained, but that the *primitive* Practice had continued of ſeveral Miniſters occaſionally bearing a Part in the miniſterial ſervice? And whatever my Brethren may think of me in reſpect to this, I declare I am *ſerious*, and that it is a Caſe which hath ſtuck cloſe to me for many Years; and if this Goſpel Method was revived among us, that Miniſters did not practiſe *Reading* inſtead of *Preaching*, nor yet *ſtint* and *confine* themſelves to their *Compoſures*, but took the Liberty to ſpeak from their *Fund or Store of divine Things*, agreeable to the preſent Frame of their Soul, they, I am perſuaded, would not only ſpeak powerfully, but alſo be capable to ſuit their Doctrine agreeable to the known State of their Hearers before them, and likewiſe be qualified to *preach* on any accidental Occaſion which might offer, when the *Reader*, and Perſon that con-

fines

fines himſelf to his *Compoſure*, is liable to loſe the Opportunity which otherwiſe he might have had of doing good, in the Exerciſe of his *miniſterial Function*.

And here I will inſert a Caſe which gave me an early diſlike to the *Reading-Method*. There was an *ancient reading Miniſter*, who was to have taken both Parts of the Day, who began in the Morning as uſual, and proceeded on, not minding the Time, and continued ſomething longer than common, ſo that he came to the Application before he was aware of it, which when he obſerved it ſomewhat ſurpriſed him, and this was attended with a little Confuſion, becauſe the Sermon was deſigned for the whole Day; however he ſoon concluded, after which he immediately went and told ſome Friends the Caſe, how through earneſtneſs he had almoſt ended the Diſcourſe before he was aware; and added, that tho' he had *Notes* at home, yet his Sight was ſo bad, that he did not think proper to venture in the Afternoon, unleſs he had a conſiderable Time to peruſe them, which the Seaſon would not then admit of; and therefore, ſays he, *Brethren what ſhall we do?* Silence I underſtood took place for a ſhort time, after which he ſaid to this Purpoſe: *That there was ſuch a Friend*, naming of him, *is appointed to exerciſe in the Evening, what if we ſhould call him forth in publick this Afternoon?* and this was approved of; but then the Enquiry was, where they ſhould find him? The Anſwer was, that he was gone home; ſo then it was concluded it would not anſwer any valuable Purpoſe to ſend after him, as the Time was far ſpent, but that they would apply to him, as ſoon he came for the Afternoon, which was accordingly done; and as the Caſe was laid before him, he complied with the Requeſt, and

I well remember that he took for his *Text* the Words of the Prophet *Nahum*, Chap. i. 6.

Now this Caſe which I have thus related, as I ſaid before, gave me an early diſlike to the *Reading Method*, and that becauſe I plainly ſaw it was, and might be attended with a great many Diſappointments, which the *Preacher* is not liable to.

And I likewiſe find a Relation in a certain Author, who ſpeaks of a *Diſſenting Miniſter* who happened to leave his Notes at Home; who, when he came to the Meeting-houſe, miſſing his Sermon, whiſpered to one to go and fetch it: Accordingly we are told he went and made diligent Search, but could find none; which, when the Miniſter underſtood, it gave him "ſome painful Reflections;" and, ſays the Author, "he roſe up, and plainly "told the Congregation the *Sermon* was loſt, and "therefore they were to have none that Day." And doubtleſs great was the Confuſion of the Miniſter, and not leſs the Diſappointment of the Society: However, to prevent ſuch Accidents for the future, he aſſured his People that he would *never preach by Notes again.* And here an Application offers itſelf to me, but I chuſe to ſtop my Pen.

Once more I find in the Works of another Author, who tells us, that a certain Miniſter, accounted a *famous Preacher*, who was deſired to *preach a Funeral Sermon*, whoſe Method was to write at large, and get it by *rote of Heart*; but the Time allotted was too ſhort for that, ſo that he could only compoſe it in writing; and when the Time came he brought the *Sermon* with him in his Hand, and ſo aſcended the Pulpit, and in a little Time addreſſed himſelf to the People in the following Words: "Whatſoever I have been able to gather with the "Travel of this Night I bring here *written* in this "*Paper*,

" *Paper*, and beſeech you——to hear the ſame " with Patience, and pardon my ſlender Memory:" He then proceeded; but the Author tells us, that the " Faſhion of *rehearſing* with Paper in the Hand " ſo highly diſpleaſed the Audience, *that ſome* " *ſmiled, while others murmured.*" And thus by this Method of *Reading* inſtead of *Preaching*, the weighty Concerns relating to a Preparation for Death was rendered uſeleſs, and in all probability the Miniſter had but little Pleaſure or Satisfaction in his Labour. And here I might go on, not only to take notice of the many diſappointments, but alſo of the fatal Effects which manifeſtly attend the *Reading Method*, both as to the Miniſters themſelves, and ſuch as attend their Miniſtrations, and likewiſe as it doth affect the Chriſtian Cauſe in general; but this is ſo manifeſt, and what is ſo frequently taken notice of, by way of Grief and Complaint, both in *Town* and *Country*, that the Caſe doth ſufficiently declare itſelf. And indeed what otherwiſe can be expected, when Men depart from the Way of God, and give into the *Traditions* and *Inventions of Men*; but I chuſe not here to enlarge, but will go on to anſwer ſuch Arguments, which are made uſe of in favour of the *Reading Method.*

Firſt Argument, That Miniſters in preaching perſonate God, and therefore ought to be very exact in what they deliver.

Anſwer. That they do in ſome low Senſe perſonate God is allowed, but then that will not at all tolerate them to go out of *God's Way*, but rather contains an Argument that they ſhould ſtand up according to his Counſel, or plead with Mankind in the Way of his Appointment, And farther, tho' Miniſters ought carefully to deliver themſelves in the beſt Manner they can, yet no more is required

of them than they have Abilities given them to perform; and if in Sincerity they do the beſt they can, declaring the Goſpel in *Plainneſs* and *Simplicity*, though their Service ſhould be attended with ſome Imperfections, yet no doubt but God will accept of their Labour, to whom as their *Maſter they muſt ſtand or fall.* And whatever *mean* and *low* Thoughts ſome may have of *Preaching*, when compared to *Reading*, and whatever Reflections or Ridicule may be caſt on it, yet let us remember that it is God's own Way, and though Men may look on Preaching as they did in *Saint Paul*'s Day of Chriſtianity in general, which we are told was *every where ſpoken againſt*; I ſay, notwithſtanding it ſhould ſo happen, it would not be amiſs to call to mind, that it was *by the Fooliſhneſs of Preaching that God would ſave them that believe.* To conclude this, I would ask, whether there is not ſometimes Miſtakes in *Writing*, and alſo Blunders made in *Reading?* And whether an Imperfection in ſpeaking *off-hand*, doth not as much merit a charitable Thought as in Reading, what with Time and Pains hath been committed to Writing. And agreeable to this ſays a learned *Biſhop:* " Some Word that is irregular, or, if you " will, ſome weak or miſapplied Expreſſion that " may happen to drop in the Warmth of Action, " but ſurely they muſt have narrow Souls who can " think ſuch little Eſcapes worth any one's Notice. " There is *(ſays he)* Abundance of theſe to be met " with in the moſt excellent Originals. The great- " eſt *Orators* among the Antients neglected them, " and if our Views were as noble as theirs, we " ſhould not ſo much regard theſe TRIFLES which " can amuſe none but ſuch as are not able to diſ- " cern and purſue what is truly great."

Second

Second Argument, That there is no ſuch Thing as Preaching now, it is only recommending Chriſtianity, *&c.*

In *Anſwer* to this wonderful and ſurpriſing Argument, which I have heard made uſe of, I ſay, That whatever is to be underſtood by recommending, it is plain that ſuch who make uſe of it in favour of their Scheme, do underſtand it to be different, or another Exerciſe from *Preaching*; for, ſay they, *there is no ſuch thing as Preaching now.* From whence I argue, that if there is no ſuch thing as Preaching now, then Preaching is now *null* and *ceaſed*; which, if ſo, then one Part of our Lord's *Commiſſion* or Religion is not binding upon us; the Conſequence of which, according to *Mr. Killingworth*, is, " that not any one Part of Chriſtianity, " as the Religion of Chriſt Jeſus, can be at all " binding upon us, whilſt ſome other Parts of it, " depending upon the ſame Authority, are not ſo." Beſides, though recommending a ſteddy Adherence to Chriſtianity is very neceſſary to profeſſed Chriſtians, yet it doth not follow from thence that the Goſpel is not now to be *preached*; for are there not many *Jews*, *Deiſts*, and a *young Generation* to be brought over to the Faith of Chriſt? And are they to be denied the ordinary Means appointed by God? And farther I would ask, whether the Goſpel is not *recommended* where it is preached; though according to the above Argument it is not preached where it is recommended? In ſhort, for any Chriſtian thus to argue, ſhews the *Diſtreſs* they are drove to in defending their Cauſe; or it doth detect their Attachment to primitive Chriſtianity, which they profeſs to have eſpouſed.

Third Argument, That it oftentimes hath pleaſed God to convince Perſons by a *Reading Miniſtry*, and therefore,—— *Anſwer.*

Anſwer, By the ſame Argument we may as well lay aſide *aſſembling ourſelves together* for the public Worſhip of God; for I believe it muſt be allowed, that ſome perſons have been convinced, only by reading the Scriptures themſelves: But ſuppoſe the above be granted, that ſome Perſons have been convinced by a *reading Miniſtry*; will that be a ſufficient Warrant for Miniſters to alter or change any of God's Ways? or, that becauſe ſuch a Method may ſometimes meet with Succeſs will that juſtify Men to go on in their own inventions? Which is to be the Rule to us, God's particular dealing with ſome, or his revealed will in common? Beſides, it may be a great Difficulty to aſcertain, that a Perſon was convinced by a *reading Miniſtry*; ſince the Means of Grace, in order for the converſion of Sinners, is not limited to the *Pulpit*.

Fourth Argument. That *reading Sermons* hath by length of Time and Cuſtom received a kind of *Sanction*, and is now become moſt agreeable to the *Miniſters and People*.

Anſwer. But will the long ſtanding of an error make it Truth? or can length of time give a proper *Sanction?* If ſo, did our worthy *Patriots* do well in the Reformation, when *Popery* had then been long ſtanding in this Nation? And would the eſtabliſhed Church be juſtifiable to leave off *Sprinkling* in Baptiſm, and practiſe *Dipping*; ſince Sprinkling is of as old a Date as *reading Sermons*? And tho' it may be moſt agreeable to ſome Miniſters and People, yet I am ſatisfied it is far from being ſo to all; for *Biſhop Burnet* tells us, that "reading *Sermons* is peculiar to this Nation, and is ENDURED in NO "other." *Paſtoral Care*, Chap. 10. P. 205. And ſays another Author, "The *primitive Fathers* knew "nothing

" nothing of it; *and* their Succeſſors in all After-
" ages knew as little of it; and even in this Age,
" as far as we know, there is no Denomination of
" *Clergy*, *Greek* or *Latin*, *Papiſt* or *Proteſtant*, in
" any Nation (*England* excepted) that give into this
" unprecedented Method of *reading* their Diſcourſes
" to the People for *Preaching*." So that from hence, together with what we ourſelves may alſo know in this Affair, I think it is evident, that *Reading* inſtead of *Preaching* is far from being agreeable to all; but if it was, that would not prove that ſuch a Method is juſtifiable, nor well pleaſing to God. Beſides; if that which at any time, without a *New-Teſtament Precept* or *Precedent*, becomes moſt agreeable to *Miniſters* and *People*, muſt be practiſed and retained by Chriſtians as Part of the *Chriſtian Service*; I ſay, if ſo, I fear we ſhould ſoon find Chriſtianity ſo metamorphoſed, or changed, that if *Saint Paul* was to come again, he would find Occaſion to withſtand us to the Face, as he did his *Brother Peter*, *Gal.* ii. 5, 11. And would not ſuch profeſſed Chriſtians fall juſtly under his Sentence, mentioned Chap. i. 5, 8, 9.? And though *reading Sermons* inſtead of preaching them has obtained for ſome Time; yet if we may regard the Authority of *Biſhop Burnet*, its *Original* will not make it valid. For, according to him, it had its *Riſe* but in *King Henry* the Eighth's Reign, after the *Six bloody Articles* was agreed upon; and on account of which both *Papiſt* and *Proteſtant* were hanged and burnt in *Smithfield*, and none was allowed or ſuffered by Authority to preach but ſuch as were licenſed; and they were required to preach agreeable to the Religion then eſtabliſhed.

But

But notwithſtanding this, we find there were ſome of the *licenſed Preachers*, who did in their Preaching oppoſe the ſame, of which we are told there was *great Complaints*; and hence thoſe *Miniſters* that did comply with the Religion then ſet up, fearing they might be accuſed as well as others, by the Informers then employed, did, to juſtify themſelves, *write*, and *read* their Sermons. And this, ſo far as I can find, was the ORIGINAL of the Reading Method, which at this Day is ſo much in vogue. Fine Authority indeed, for *Proteſtant Diſſenters*, to ground a *Mode* of adminiſtring an Ordinance of Chriſt upon! See the *Biſhop's Abridgment of the Reformation*, fourth *Edition*, Page 234. where agreeable to the above he ſays, "*And thus did this Cuſtom be-*" *gin.*" And this was in the Year 1542, which, when compared with the Date of Chriſtianity, may I think juſtly be called a modern Invention; and therefore it is manifeſt that it falls vaſtly ſhort, both in *Antiquity* and proper *Authority*, to juſtify or recommend the Practice in the Chriſtian church.

Again, in *Queen Mary's bloody Reign*, in the Year 1555, Orders were ſent to the *Juſtices* to look narrowly to Preachers; and ſecret Spies were employed in every Pariſh to give Information, *&c.* See the *Biſhop's Hiſtory*, P. 488. And if I may regard what another Author ſays, there was at that Time ſuch Methods taken, and Orders given by the *Papiſts* then in Power, that the *Miniſters* were obliged to *write* and *read* their Sermons, that ſo they in Authority might have it in their Power to examine the Doctrines preached, and ſee how they agreed with the *Tenets* of the Church of *Rome*. And thus this Practice took place by *popiſh Influence*, and the *Clergy* of this Nation have ever ſince continued

in

in the ſame Practice, from whom the *Diſſenting Miniſters* in all Probability received it!

Fifth Argument. That the Memory is apt to be treacherous, and therefore it is not ſafe to commit all to it.

To this I ſay; that it does not appear neceſſary to commit every Word to the Memory, and I believe there are but few, if any, pretend ſo to do; nor doth it appear that was the primitive Practice; but rather, as hath been before obſerved, they preached by the *rich Indwelling of the Word of God*, whereby, according to the Abilities received, they were capable uſefully to adminiſter the ſame, agreeable to that Part of Chriſtian Doctrine they were upon; and this Method, I am apt to conclude with a certain Author, "tends more to renew the "Heart, and reform the Life, than a written for-"mal Harangue, conſiſting of *fenecal* pithy Sen-"tences, periodical Flights, numerous ſmooth Ca-"dences, pointed Phraſes, and picked Words; tho' "this indeed may pleaſe the Ear, and tickle the "Fancy;" but what real Good doth attend ſuch a Miniſtry may beſt be underſtood, by reflecting on the religious State of ſuch Societies, either in *City*, or *Country*, where this kind of *Miniſtry* hath been long in uſe.

Sixth Argument. It is lawful, becauſe it is not forbid in the *New Teſtament.*

Anſw. If ſuch Things, which are not forbid in the New Teſtament, are lawful to be joined to the Chriſtian Religion, why do we find Fault with *Papiſts* for adding their *Ceremonies* thereto? and why do we require of the *Pædo-baptiſts* plain Scripture for *Infant-Sprinkling*, ſince Infant-Sprinkling is not there expreſsly forbidden? Beſides, if *New Teſtament Precept*, and *Precedent*, in a particular

Service, do imply a Prohibition of any Change or Alteration in that Service; as I think it doth, then to introduce *Reading* inſtead of *Preaching*, is in ſome ſenſe forbidden; and that there is New Teſtament *Precept* and *Precedent* for *Preaching*, and none for *Reading*, I think all Chriſtians muſt allow: And it may not be amiſs for ſuch as make uſe of this Argument, to reflect on the Caſe of *Nadab* and *Abihu*, *Lev.* x. 1, 2.

Seventh Argument. That the ſame Doctrine, or Goſpel-truths, may be delivered by *Reading*, as by *Preaching*.

To which I *anſwer*, that though it may be allowed that the ſame *Doctrine*, &c. may be delivered by *Reading*, as by *Preaching*; yet this will not juſtify the Uſe of *Reading* in the room or ſtead of *Preaching*; becauſe it is not the Matter delivered that is the Point in debate; but the *Mode*, or *Manner* in which that Doctrine is to be adminiſtred. And as *Reading* and *Preaching* are two very different Exerciſes; and as the *latter* is the Appointment of Chriſt, and the *former*, when uſed in its ſtead, only the Invention of Men, I think no conſiſtent Chriſtian, that would maintain Obedience to his Lord, can prefer *Reading* to his Goſpel Method of *Preaching*. And I wiſh Chriſtians ſeriouſly to conſider, that the Encouragement of *Reading*, ſo far as it prevails, tends to ſubvert and root out one of the moſt uſeful Appointments contained in the *Commiſſion of Chriſt*; and if this Method ſhould go on unattack, we may ſoon expect to hear of ſome other plauſible Alterations in the remaining Inſtitutions of our Lord: And thus by degrees Chriſtianity may intirely be defaced, and the *New Teſtament* no longer regarded as the Chriſtian *Rule* of Faith and Practice, but the

the fluctuating Humour of its profeſſed Votaries, though in the main its real Enemies.

Eighth Argument. That *St. Paul* directs or injoins Reading to the Churches, as *Coloſſ.* iv. 16, 17. 1 *Theſſ.* v. 27. and therefore——

Anſwer. I allow *St. Paul* ordered ſome of his *Epiſtles* to be *read* to the Churches; and I highly approve, that the *Scriptures* be read in our *Chriſtian Aſſemblies.* But, I do not find the Apoſtle any where ordered his *Epiſtles* to be *preached*; no, but only that they ſhould be *read* to them; which alſo tends to diſcover, or ſhew, that *Reading* and *Preaching* are two diſtinct Exerciſes. And I would not have any ſuppoſe, that I am againſt *Reading in publick Aſſemblies*; for I ſhould well approve, that religious written Compoſures be occaſionally read, and ſhould be glad to ſee the Day that our *Meſſengers*, and *Brethren* of Note, did ſend their *Letters*, or *Epiſtles* of *Advice and Exhortation* to the Churches; this, together with a *Goſpel-Miniſtry*, would look like *primitive Chriſtianity* indeed: And if theſe Things were revived among us, and the whole adorned with a religious Life, our Oppoſers could have very little, if any Advantage againſt us.

Ninth Argument. That *Reading* and *Preaching* are ſynonymous Terms, and by the New Teſtament uſed as ſuch. See *Acts* xv. 21. *For Moſes of old Time hath in every City them that preach him, being read in the Synagogues every Sabbath-day*, and therefore,—

To which I *reply*, That when we are told *Moſes* was preached,——it is manifeſt, that it is to be underſtood, that the *Law of Moſes was read* to the People, and then explained; or the Senſe thereof was given; and this was the preaching *Moſes*, as is very evident from *Neh.* viii. 8. *So they read in the*

Book, in the Law of God distinctly, and gave the Sense, and caused them to understand the Reading. Here we find that the Law was *first read*, and then the Sense thereof was given; which Sense of the Law that was given, was the *preaching Moses*, mentioned *Acts* xv. 21. And hence we see that the Scripture is the best Expounder of itself: For it was not the Reading of the Law that properly was *preaching Moses*; but the Method taken, after the Law was read, to make the People *understand the Reading*. And, agreeable to this are the Words of the *learned Richard Barnard*, in his *Thesaurus Biblicus, seu Promptuarium sacrum*, under the Word *read*, where, after he hath cited *Acts* xv. 21. says, "This Place proveth not that "*Reading* is *Preaching*; but that when he (that is, "*Moses*) was read, there were such as did preach, "in the *Greek* Text (*he says*) it is clear; as also the "Practice sheweth, *Acts* xiii. 15." Compare this with *Luke* iv. 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22. and as above, *Neh.* viii. 8. From all which it still appears, that *Reading* and *Preaching* are not *synonymous Terms*, but are two distinct Exercises, both in their own Nature, and abundantly manifest so to be, from divine Revelation: Yet, I readily acknowledge that *Wilson*, in his *Dictionary*, calls *Reading Preaching*; but then, I also take Notice, according to *him*, that *Reading* is IMPROPERLY called *Preaching*; and likewise that *Preaching*, according to the proper and *Scripture* Sense, is agreeable to what I have before observed. And as the *Learned* tell us, that there is a *primary*, and a *secondary*, or a *proper*, and an *improper* Sense of Words; so, according to *Wilson*, *Reading* is but an *improper* Method of *preaching*; and therefore I think it is very plain, that, speaking according to the *Ability and Store of the Mind*, is not only the *primary*, or *proper* Way of *Preaching*, but

but alſo, that which in the New Teſtament iscalled ſo: And this I ſuppoſe none will deny; and I ſhould think, that the *primary* Senſe of the Word, as it is the *Goſpel Senſe*, ought as much in this Caſe to be regarded, as it is by us in other reſpects; eſpecially as that was the *primitive Method*. And, do we not thus plead for the *primary* Senſe of the Word *baptize*, which the Learned tell us is to *dip*; and this Way we likewiſe conclude from the New Teſtament, was the *primitive* Practice; and therefore it is we admit of no other, but ſtrictly and *religiouſly* practiſe accordingly: And if we would be conſiſtent with ourſelves, and follow the *primitive Practice* as near as we can, we ought, I ſhould think, to regard the *primary Manner*, or *Mode* in this, as well as in other Inſtitutions of Chriſt. And I alſo believe, that every Gift or Capacity, which God is pleaſed to give of publick Uſefulneſs, ought in its proper PLACE and TIME to be improved; whether it be *Prayer*, *praiſing* God, *reading* and *preaching* the Goſpel; and that no *Talent* of publick Uſe ſhould be *hid as in a Napkin*. For, *as every Man hath received the Gift, even ſo miniſter the ſame one to another, as good Stewards of the manifold Grace of God.* 1 Pet, iv. 10.

But, not farther to enlarge, only I deſire that the few following things may be duly conſidered:

Whether *preaching* the Goſpel is not an *Ordinance* of Chriſt?

Whether *Reading*, and *Preaching*, are not two different *Modes* or *Ways* of delivering the Will of God?

Whether *Miniſters* have Authority to change or alter any of the Ordinances of Chriſt, to pleaſe themſelves, or the *polite* Humors of Men?

Whether it is not their Duty, to keep as near to the *Precepts* and *Precedents* of the Goſpel as poſſible?

Whether

Whether any of the *Sermons*, in *holy Record*, were firſt delivered to the People by *Reading?*

Whether *Reading* for *Preaching* is not as great an Alteration, as can well be made in the practical Part of this Ordinance?

Whether *Reading* was in *vogue*, or ſubſtituted for *Preaching* till more than a thouſand Years after Chriſt?

And, *laſtly*, Whether *Miniſters*, as ſuch, will be judged at the great Day by a *modern Practice*, or by the Goſpel of our Lord?

Theſe Things, my *Brethren*, appear to me worthy our ſerious Conſideration; and it is not a little ſurpriſing, to find ſo many profeſſed Chriſtians approve, nay plead with ſo much warmth for a Practice, which hath no Foundation in *Nature*, nor *Precept* or *Precedent* in divine Revelation to ſupport it. I ſay it is very ſtrange; and the more ſo, when I conſider, how Chriſtians overlook and neglect a clear and expreſs Command of our Lord's, as is that of *waſhing Feet*, *John* xiii. 13, 14, 15. and at the ſame Time are ſo very zealous to bring that into the *publick Service* of God, for which there is no divine Warrant: View this Conduct in your own Minds; See whether you can reconcile it with the *New Teſtament*, and a *good Conſcience*. Can it be juſtifiable to omit what is ſo expreſs and plain, and to introduce a Practice unknown to the *primitive Church?* If there could be any ſuch Paſſage produced for *reading Sermons*, as there is for *waſhing Feet*, I conclude we ſhould have heard of it long ago, and it would be eſteemed, and that juſtly too, a ſufficient Authority to ſupport the Practice: But, alas, we find this latter moſt generally neglected, when the former has a Multitude of Advocates, though without any divine Warrant.

Thus

Thus, I have freely declared my Sentiment on this important Appointment of Chriſt, though I ſhould have been glad if ſome *able* and *learned* Hand had taken this Task on them; but I having waited near twenty Years, in hopes ſome *Friend* would have appeared in behalf of this Part of *primitive Chriſtianity*, when inſtead thereof, I found the Advocates for *Reading*, &c. much increaſe, and the *Error* ſpread itſelf like a *Contagion*; ſo that it appeared high Time ſome *Attempt* ſhould be made to ſtop its *Progreſs*; tho' I believe I ſhould not as yet have *publiſhed* it, had not ſeveral *Friends*, from different Parts, called on me, and encouraged me ſo to do, both by perſonal Application, and Writing: And I have now accordingly ſent it abroad into the World, hoping it may at leaſt excite the *baptized Churches* to take it into their Conſideration, that the Caſe may be duly examined, and that the Practice which ſhall appear moſt agreeable to the *New Teſtament* may take place, that ſo there may not in this Caſe be ſuch Occaſion given for Reflection, that we are an inconſiſtent, and a divided People.

To conclude, I am fully perſuaded, that if the *Goſpel-Mode*, or *Manner* of adminiſtring the Word was *revived*, and that due Attendance and Encouragement was given to young ſober Men, in whom appears ſome Hopes of a publick Capacity, we ſhould not only ſee Religion alive and flouriſh, but alſo have Perſons raiſed up,—as would to a good degree, be *Miniſters to the Churches*, *and the Glory of Chriſt*. For, ſaid he,——*Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the End of the World.* Amen.

The

The following ſhould be read after the *, *Page* 25*th.*

POSTSCRIPT.

For a *Preacher*, having no Stock of *written Sermons* to *read* to his People, is, of courſe, obliged to give himſelf to reading, and the Study of the Scriptures: And as the great Concerns of his *Function*, falls often with weight on his Mind; this engages him cloſely to attend thereto, and in ſo doing, he certainly is in the moſt likely Way to gain greater Improvement in uſeful Knowledge, and a more thorough Acquaintance with the Goſpel of Chriſt; and this Improvement which he thus attains, is, in a great Meaſure, the Effect of that Application, by which he is furniſhed for his publick Miniſtrations. And as he thus gives up himſelf to Meditation and Study, it will not fail (if he have a *Talent* for public Uſefulneſs) to inrich and ſtore his Mind with heavenly and divine Things, whereby *his profiting may appear to all.*

So that inſtead of its hindering the *Miniſter's Improvement*, and tending to make *him idle*, it appears quite the Reverſe: Nay, if either of the two tends that Way, it is evidently chargeable on the Reading-Method.

FINIS.

Jonathan Killingsworth, J. C.

Thos. Swanton, J. C. 15, 16

Geo. Hammond 17

Walter 17-15.

Robert Allen 15

Hughes [illegible] 20

Gale [illegible] 20, 21

Bailey [illegible] 23

Claridge [illegible] 28

Bowles [illegible] 28